

Greek-American Couples
Examining Acculturation, Egalitarianism and Intimacy

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of

Drexel University

by

Fay Tsiartsionis Karapanagiotis

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Philosophy

December 2008

© Copyright 2008

Fay T. Karapanagiotis. All Rights Reserved.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	iii
List of Figures.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
2.1 Theories and Models.....	4
2.2 Assimilation.....	8
2.3 Mobilization.....	9
2.4 Research on Acculturation.....	9
2.4.1 Measurement of Acculturation.....	14
2.5 Sex Role Issues.....	15
2.6 Greek-American Acculturation.....	18
2.6.1 Greek Language.....	18
2.6.2 The Role of the Church.....	18
2.6.3 Gender Roles.....	20
2.7 Marital Intimacy.....	23
2.7.1 Definitions and Models.....	19
2.7.2 Couples Research.....	25
2.7.3 Inter-ethnic Relationships.....	28
2.7.4 Greek-American Couples.....	31
3. RESEARCH QUESTION.....	36
3.1 Conceptual Definitions.....	37
4. METHODOLOGY.....	39
4.1 Participants.....	39
4.2 Procedure.....	40
4.3 Measurements.....	43
5. RESULTS.....	49
5.1 Univariate Statistics.....	50
5.2 Scale Reliabilities.....	53
5.3 Inferential Statistics.....	55
5.3.1 ANOVAs.....	55
5.3.2 Correlations.....	62
5.3.3 Regressions.....	65
6. DISCUSSION.....	70
6.1 Research Questions.....	70
6.2 Factor Analysis and Reliabilities.....	77

6.3 Limitations.....	78
6.4 Unanticipated Changes.....	80
6.5 Implications for Research.....	81
6.6 Implications for Clinical Work.....	83
6.7 Conclusion.....	84
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	86
APPENDIX A: Overlap of Variables.....	96
APPENDIX B: Church Announcement.....	97
APPENDIX C: Permission Letter.....	98
APPENDIX D: Consent Form.....	99
APPENDIX E: Personal Demographic Data.....	102
APPENDIX F: Greek-American Acculturation Scale.....	103
APPENDIX G: Vancouver Index of Acculturation.....	107
APPENDIX H: Personal Assessment of Intimacy on Relationships.....	108
APPENDIX I: Egalitarian Questionnaire.....	110
APPENDIX J: Researcher's Instructions.....	112
APPENDIX K: Debriefing.....	113
APPENDIX L: Permission to Use the VIA.....	114
APPENDIX M: Vancouver Index of Acculturation.....	115
APPENDIX N: Scoring the PAIR.....	116
APPENDIX O: Permission to Use the PAIR.....	118
APPENDIX P: Greek-American Acculturation Scale Revised.....	119
APPENDIX Q: GAAS Scale and Subscales' Reliabilities.....	122
APPENDIX R: GAASR Factor Analysis.....	124
APPENDIX S: VIAM Scale Reliabilities.....	125
APPENDIX T: VIAM Factor Analysis.....	126
APPENDIX U: PAIR and Subscales' Reliabilities.....	127
APPENDIX V: PAIR Factor Analysis.....	129
APPENDIX W: EQR Factor Analysis.....	131
APPENDIX X: EQ, EQR and Subscales' Reliabilities.....	132
VITA.....	134

List of Tables

1. Age of Subjects by Groups.....	50
2. Gender Subjects by Groups.....	50
3. Generation of Subjects by Groups.....	51
4. Children of Subjects by Groups.....	51
5. Years Married of Subjects by Groups.....	51
6. Household Income of Subjects by Groups.....	52
7. Level of Education of Subjects by Groups.....	52
8. Table 3.1.....	55
9. Table 3.2.....	57
10. Table 3.3.....	57
11. GAASR and Subscales.....	59
12. VIAM	60
13. PAIR and Subscales.....	60
14. EQR and Subscales.....	61

15. Table 4.1	62
16. Table 4.2.....	63
17. Table 4.3.....	63
18. Table 5.1.....	64
19. Table 5.2.....	65
20. Table 5.3.....	66
21. Table 5.4.....	67

List of Figures

1. Acculturation and Assimilation.....	7
2. Variables for this study.....	37

Abstract

Greek-American Couples

Examining Acculturation, Egalitarianism and Intimacy

Fay T. Karapanagiotis

This research study investigated several questions about Greek-American couples:

1) Is there a relationship between an individual's profile of acculturation and perceived intimacy and egalitarianism in his/her marital relationship? 2) Are there differences in perceived levels of intimacy and egalitarianism between members of mono- and inter-ethnic couples? 3) Do gender and generation affect a partner's profile of acculturation? 4) Do gender and generation affect a partner's perception of intimacy and egalitarianism in his/her marital relationship?

Participants were sixty married couples from a Greek Orthodox Church in Southern New Jersey, with at least one member of each couple self identified as Greek-American. Each spouse filled out four assessment instruments: 1) Greek acculturation was assessed by the Greek-American Acculturation Scale Revised (GAASR), 2) American acculturation was assessed by a modified version of the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIAM), 3) perception of intimacy was assessed by the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR), and 4) the perception of egalitarianism was assessed by the Egalitarian Questionnaire (EQ) (a scale developed for this study).

The results yielded a high correlation between intimacy and egalitarianism, indicating good concurrent validity for the EQ. Additionally, Greek participants who

were married to Greek partners yielded statistically significant differences on scores of the GAASR indicating that participants in mono-ethnic marriages are more acculturated to Greek culture, whereas Greek subjects appeared to be more Americanized if they selected a partner outside of their ethnic group. This study found a statistical significant negative correlation between the GAASR and the VIAM; however, this correlation was small enough to suggest that different aspects of acculturation were being examined. This finding supports Berry's bi-dimensional model of acculturation. None of the covariates investigated contributed to outcome variables.

More research exploring the experience of acculturation on immigrants and succeeding generations must be conducted in order to help both researchers and clinicians better understand how the process of acculturation affects one's marriage.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Immigrant issues are of vital importance to the United States, a land of immigrants in which “twenty-five percent of the U.S. population was classified as ‘minority’ in 2000, it is projected that by the year 2050 more than 50% of the U.S. population will be from non-European backgrounds” (La Roche & Maxie, 2003, p. 180). Greek-Americans are just one group, comprising .4% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005). When immigrants encounter a new host society, they are faced with many challenges in terms of adjusting. The spectrum of challenges include, but are not limited to; language barriers, different customs, unfamiliar rules/laws, employment, education and support systems (Vlachos, 1968). For example, Eastern cultures often times pride themselves in a belief system of working collectively and dependently with one another, whereas Western culture discourages dependency and promotes a belief system of individualism (Ben-Ari & Lavee, 2004).

During the 1960’s the civil rights movement brought about progressive changes for ethnic minorities in the United States (Makedon, 1989; Simon, 1979). These changes made it easier for Greeks to maintain their cultural identity rather than modify or relinquish it. For example, prior to the civil rights movement, it was not unusual for Greek-Americans to anglicize their names for the purpose of acceptance (Makedon, 1989; Moskos, 1980). A Greek name such as Karapanagiotis would have been changed to Karas, or the name Antoniadis would be modified to Andy (Makedon, 1989). Today, the impending pressure of changing one’s original Greek name to “fit in” as an American has greatly been reduced (Makedon, 1989; Moskos, 1980).

Acculturation refers to this process of adjusting to these life changes. The process of acculturation is thought to be a process that varies for each individual. According to Berry and Kim (1988), attempting to negotiate one's ethnic culture with his/her new host culture can lead to increased stress, otherwise known as "acculturative stress". A number of researchers (Zheng & Berry, 1991; Neff & Hoppe, 1992) have found that when there is greater "acculturative stress", the risk for psychological problems (e.g., depression and anxiety) increases, therefore resulting in a direct impact on an individual's intimate relationships.

Despite the widespread attention on cultural awareness and couples' issues, only one empirical study regarding the relationship between acculturation and marital intimacy has been found in this research. Professional literature has devoted widespread attention to studies of intimacy. However, there is a great need for research on the experience of acculturation in the United States of America and the enduring effects of being bicultural on intimacy. Specifically, there has been limited research on how various acculturation issues (e.g., language, customs and traditions) impact a couple. According to Lonnie Athens (1996), Greeks are one of the smallest ethnic groups in North America. This may be the reason that Greeks have been overlooked and under-examined. This research was initiated in an attempt to increase the understanding of Greek-American couples, specifically in terms of Greek-Americans' level of acculturation as it may or may not relate to the couples' perceived intimacy.

In an effort to maintain homogeneity, it is common practice for Greeks and other ethnic groups to "encourage family members to select a spouse from within the same ethnic group, rather than seeking a spouse from an 'outsider' group" (Demos, 1994,

p.82). Whether partners consciously or unconsciously chose a partner from the same ethnic culture, the presumption is that these endogamous couples are then able to implement a legacy of their ethnic heritage (Demos, 1994). It is therefore imperative that therapists have a heightened awareness of just how important a social issue acculturation is. Specifically, more knowledge is needed about acculturation levels of Greek-American couples and their intimacy-based relationships. In an attempt to broaden therapist's views and enhance their ability to effectively service multicultural clients, this dissertation could be fruitfully applied to the study and treatment of ethnic couples and their families.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Acculturation

Theories and Models

The theory of acculturation refers to the changes in cultural patterns (e.g., language, values, norms, and customs) between the ethnic culture and the host culture (Berry, 1998; Phinney, 1990). In examining the process of acculturation, the individual is often lost as the group he/she belongs to is the primary focus (Berry, 1990; Phinney, 1990). There is rarely any consideration to unique individual differences, especially if it is not pertinent to the variable(s) being examined.

As assimilation is the first concept of acculturation. The process of assimilation as defined by Humphrey & Louis (1973) is, “the disappearance of ethnicity over time, as continual contact with the dominant culture occurs” (p.34). As an individual assimilates to the dominant culture over time, it is expected that with each passing generation there would be far less identification with the individual’s ethnic culture (Harris & Verven, 1996; Humphrey & Louis, 1973).

The second concept, mobilization, is comprised of having a “psychological identification and a continuous framework of ethnic relationships with a given ethnic group from one generation to the next” (Humphrey & Louis, 1973, p. 35). A conscious effort is made by individuals of a particular ethnic group to continually engage in their ethnic customs and rituals (Harris & Verven, 1996; Humphrey & Louis, 1973). In spite of how engaged an ethnic individual may be in his/her new host culture, a concerted effort in passing down his/her ethnic culture to the succeeding generation is his/her chief goal (Harris & Verven, 1996; Humphrey & Louis, 1973). There would be fewer

expected generational differences among ethnic groups who transcribe to mobilization (Harris & Verven, 1998; Humphrey & Louis, 1973).

Within the theory of acculturation, there are two types of models that exist; a unidirectional model and a multidirectional model. The unidirectional model posits that one's ethnic identity gets "weakened" as the individual's ethnic identity with the host culture "strengthens" making it difficult, if not impossible, for an individual to maintain their original ethnic identity (Andujo, 1988; Flores, Tschann, Marin, Pantoja, 2004; Phinney, 1990, p. 501).

Berry's model of acculturation (1979, 1980) identifies four different processes that can occur for an individual; assimilation, integration, separation and marginality. Assimilation according to Berry (1979, 1980) occurs when an individual adapts the traditions/customs of the dominant culture and rejects his/her own ethnic culture; integration is when an individual is able to incorporate both his/her ethnic culture and the dominant culture; separation is when an individual denies the dominant culture and only practices his/her own ethnic customs/tradition; and marginality is when an individual rejects both his/her own ethnic culture, as well as the dominant societies culture.

Berry's process of assimilation is indicative of the unidirectional process. It is often described as a continuum, where at one end of the spectrum is one's ethnic culture and at the other end of the spectrum is the dominant society's culture (Phinney, 1998). Contrary to Berry's unidirectional process is his process of integration. Integration is a bidirectional or multidirectional process.

The multi-directional model offers a different perspective. This model asserts that it is possible for an individual to maintain his/her ethnic identity and identity with his/her

host culture at the same time (Phinney, 1990). Each identification does not necessarily have to influence the other (Berry, 1990, 1998; Flores, Tschann, Marin, Pantoja, 2004; Phinney, 1990). This framework encompasses two simultaneously operating ideas, cultural maintenance and participation. The first idea is defined by the extent to which an individual aims for cultural identity and its maintenance (Berry, 1990, 1998).

Participation, the second idea, refers to the extent to which members of a cultural group become involved with other cultural groups or remain primarily among themselves (Berry, 1990, 1998). Therefore, ethnic group members can have either strong or weak identifications with their ethnic or dominant cultures (Berry, 1998; Phinney, 1998; Sodowsky & Plake, 1992). Maintaining a strong ethnic identity does not assume a weak relationship with the dominant culture (Berry, 1998; Phinney, 1998; Sodowsky & Plake, 1992).

The concept of acculturation as encompassing both the acquisition of new cultural traits and maintenance of a heritage's culture is evident, for instance, in the theoretical formulation of acculturation proposed by Menodoza (1989) and Mendoza and Martinez (1981). Mendoza and Martinez (1981) theorize that acculturation is the degree of retention of one's native cultural norms, as well as the degree of acquisition of the customs of an alternative society. Berry's (1980) typology of the acculturation model is similar to Mendoza and Martinez's view, also based on two dimensions; retention of cultural identity and positive relationship to the dominant society.

The multidirectional process, as described by Berry's model, refers to how an individual from one particular ethnic group adapts socially and psychologically to a new culture (Berry, 1979, 1980). During this process an individual uses both the value system

of the ethnic group and the value system of the host culture as reference points (Berry, 1980). In spite of having to contend with two different points of reference, it is possible for these two relationships to remain independent from one another (Berry, 1980; Phinney, 1998; Sodowsky & Plake, 1992).

Sodowsky and Plake (1992) also define acculturation as having two different processes. Similar to Berry, but using different terminology, Sodowsky and Plake (1992) state that acculturation can be viewed as either a linear or two-dimensional process. According to Sodowsky and Plake (1992) the linear process, like that of Berry's unidirectional process, occurs when an individual adopts the norms, values, and traditions of the host country while relinquishing those of the country of origin, therefore resulting in a strong acculturation with the dominant group. On the other hand, when acculturation is two-dimensional, also referred to as multidirectional, individuals retain various degrees of loyalty to and involvement with both the culture of origin and the culture or cultures of the host country (Sodowsky & Plake, 1992).

<u>Identification with dominant group</u>	<u>Identification with ethnic group</u>	
	Strong	Weak
Strong	Acculturated Bicultural	Assimilated
Weak	Ethnically identified Separated	Marginal

(Phinney, 1998, p.78)

Figure 1
Acculturation and Assimilation

Assimilation

Gordon's research (1964) on ethnicity has highlighted the distinction between the model of acculturation and assimilation. As stated earlier, acculturation primarily refers to an immigrant group acquiring particular cultural patterns (such as language) of the host society, whereas the process of assimilation involves the entrance of ethnics into the business, civic, and social life of the host society (Gordon, 1964). What most differentiates the model of assimilation from the acculturation model is that in models of assimilation, individuals and their offspring will eventually become full members of the majority group's culture, and lose their identification with their culture of origin (Organista, Chun & Marin, 1998). By contrast, the acculturation model implies that the individual, while becoming a competent participant in the dominant culture, will always be identified as a member of the ethnic culture (Organista, Chun & Marin, 1998).

Assimilation is viewed as a linear model which entails being absorbed into the new culture. The theory is founded on the basis that as individuals have continual contact with the dominant culture their ethnicity will eventually fade (Berry, 1988, 1990; Gordon, 1964). For all assimilation models the underlying assumption is that "an individual of one culture loses his or her original cultural identity as he or she acquires a new identity in a second culture" (LaFramboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1998, p. 126). Family formation and friendships, without regard to ethnic differences are also components that are inclusive of the assimilation process (Gordon, 1964; Saloutos, 1973). An individual's ethnic identity concedes to the dominant culture because of environmental factors, such as employment and education (Ben Ari & Lavee, 2004; Berry, 1990; Gordon, 1964). When the dominant cultures norms and values are entirely

accepted by the immigrant(s) the assimilation process is fulfilled (Berry, 1988, 1990; Gordon, 1964). Similarly, Keijo Virtanen defines achieving assimilation as “the immigrant is assimilated when he/she does not emphasize consciously his ethnic background any more but instead connects him/herself and his/her interests to his/her new homeland” (1981, p.104).

Mobilization

The theory of mobilization hypothesizes that a “psychological identification occurs within an ethnic group” (Harris & Verven, 1996, p.600). This psychological identification is noted as being continuous from one generation to the next, maintaining a continued structure of ethnic relations (Harris & Verven, 1996; 1998). Regardless of the decreased mobilization that occurs with each passing generation (e.g., change in fashions, language patterns, and place of residence), ethnic social behavior continues to be an influential variable in the acculturation process, therefore maintaining a strong ethnic identity (Harris & Verven, 1996; 1998).

Mobilization typically reinforces preferred institutions and values (SinghaRoy, 2004). Similar in ways to two-directional theory, mobilization, whether it is political or social, enables an individual to maintain a sense of collective identity (Ross, Cottrell, St-Cyr & Rawkins, 1980). Mobilization is likely to fluctuate at different developmental stages for each individual (Ross et al., 1980).

Research on Acculturation

Ethnic groups and individuals acculturate at different rates (Dion & Dion, 1996). The process of acculturation is dependent on a multitude of facets, ranging from an ethnic group's sociocultural history to the new host culture's customs (Dion & Dion,

1996). Measuring instruments for acculturation vary, and range significantly.

Acculturation instruments may examine only one variable (e.g., language) (Ortiz & Arce, 1984), to several variables (e.g., customs, food preparation and religious beliefs) (Harris & Verven, 1996; Mendoza, 1989; Suinn, Khoo, & Ahuna, 1995). The host society's immigration laws and the generational status of the individual are two variables that have been repeatedly documented in the literature as affecting one's acculturation process (Berry, 1990; Georgas, Berry, Shaw, Christakopoulou, & Mylonas, 1996; Liem, Lim & Liem, 2000).

According to Demos (1989), "the most powerful variable of dissimilarity among group members in the ethnic-group literature is *generation in America*" (p.85). The U.S. Bureau of the Census (1973) defines *generation in America* as: the first generation being born outside of the United States (U.S.); second generation as being born within the U.S., and having one or both parents being born outside of the U.S.; and third generation as being born in the U.S., as well as having both parents born in the U.S. (Demos, 1989; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973).

Silverstein and Chen (1999) used data from the Study of Three-Generation Mexican American Families (STGMF) survey. Their sample consisted of 353 grandchild-grandparent dyads and investigated individual and intergenerational acculturation between these dyads in relation to contact and intimacy. Overall, their findings suggest "that the gap in cultural values between generations suppresses social interaction between grandparents and grandchildren and over time reduces intimacy in their relationship" (Silverstein & Chen, 1999, p. 196). Silverstein and Chen (1999) found a significant effect ($p < .001$) of grandchildren's acculturation on affection. The results

of their findings yielded that the grandchildren who were less acculturated reported stronger affection towards their grandparents (Silverstein & Chen, 1999).

Generational status of immigrants has yielded reliable findings in the literature (Padilla, Alvarez, & Lindholm, 1986; Ghaffarian, 1998; Ying, 2002). A study that was conducted by Ghaffarian (1998) examined the acculturation of Iranian immigrants in the United States. Ghaffarian's study (1998) investigated the process of acculturation and its potential effects on various variables, such as, age, gender, duration of stay in the United States and educational ability.

Ghaffarian's study was comprised of 238 participants in all, 108 who were women and 130 of whom were men. All participants were immigrants who resided in the Los Angeles area. Their average age was 39. Participants were contacted either through dining in Iranian restaurants, participating in Iranian social clubs or groups, "or through snowball sampling" (Ghaffarian, 1998, p. 647). This study found a significant negative correlation between the number of years of residence in the United States and cultural resistance ($r = -.51, p < .001$) (Ghaffarian, 1998, p.649). These results indicate that the longer residency an individual maintained in the United States the higher his/her level of acculturation. These same individuals also showed the lowest levels of cultural resistance, supporting the notion that the process of acculturation was occurring (Ghaffarian, 1998).

Although these results may be difficult to generalize to other ethnic minority groups, the results are supportive of other studies that have found that the variable of generational status does play a significant role in an individual's acculturation process (e.g., Padilla et al., 1986; Ying, 2002).

The acculturation process is rarely experienced without stress. Higher stress levels have been associated with different language and cultural backgrounds, as well as the educational environment (Padilla et al., 1986). For example, 247 subjects participated in a quantitative study that was conducted by Padilla, Alvarez, & Lindholm (1986) which examined the effect of generational status on stress and several personality measures (p. 275). The sample included participants who were early immigrants, late immigrants, second-generation, and third/later generation. The participants were of various origins, which included Asia, Europe, Latin America and Africa. All subjects were students who received extra class credit for participating in this study. Padilla et al. (1986) findings revealed that generational status had an effect in three of the four scales that were administered. The effect of generational status on stress ($p < .001$), self-esteem ($p < .001$) and locus of control ($p < .001$) yielded significant findings, particularly for late immigrants (immigration after the age of fourteen). It was clearly indicated by the findings that those first generation students who immigrated after the age of fourteen experienced the greatest stress (Padilla et al., 1986). Although the study does not explain the possible reason(s) for the increased stress in these older children, one explanation may be that younger children may be more resilient in coping with stressful experiences. With this being said, it is difficult to generalize these findings due to the nature of the specific characteristics and motivations of the chosen sample.

Another study conducted by Ying (2002) examined the effects of cross-cultural living on personality in 97 immigrant Taiwanese graduate students. Data was collected pre-arrival, as well as one and two years after their arrival to the United States. Ying hypothesized "that cross-cultural living would result in participants becoming more

withdrawn socially, during the first two years of living in the United States” (Ying, 2002, p. 364). Ying’s study suggested that acculturation strategies of assimilation and accommodation were used at years one and two after arrival in order to adjust to cross-cultural living. Accommodation “entails the formation of new adaptive structures or schemas to integrate or make sense of previously discrepant experiential elements” (Ying, 2002, p. 364). The main effect of time was significant at $p < .001$. This means that participants had needed two years in order to become more competent and adjusted to cross-cultural challenges (Ying, 2002). Ying also noted that the findings with respect to gender differences and becoming more socially withdrawn did not reveal any significant results. The researcher acknowledges that because this sample was recruited from a particular nation, generalizability of these findings to other groups is unclear (Ying, 2002). The small sample size in conjunction with the participants being graduate students further limits the study’s generalizability. These results potentially exclude adults who may be older, more mature or have more life experience.

Lastly, Scourby (1980) examined the effects of acculturation on Greek-American families. Scourby’s study found that newly arrived first- and second-generation families were able to avoid some of the effects of acculturation, specifically active cultural resistance. Scourby’s study (1980) consisted of one hundred sixty individuals (46% males, and 54% females), ranging in age from 13 to 68 years old, who were of Greek descent and lived in the New York metropolitan area (p.46). A questionnaire comprised of items measuring assimilation was administered (Scourby, 1980). Some of the constructs that Scourby used to measure assimilation included; language, intermarriage, ethnic identity, and religious attitudes. Her results showed that there was a statistically

significant ($p < .01$) “association between ethno-religious identification and generation” (Scourby, 1980, p.50). Her findings also revealed that in respect to ethno-religious beliefs, first generation Greek-Americans maintained the strongest attachment to their ethnic roots whereas that was not the case for second and third generation Greek-Americans (Scourby, 1980). This trend undoubtedly will increase the rates of intermarriages in generations to come (Scourby, 1980). Considering that Greek ethnic women are the central transmitters of ethnicity in the home, positive support and encouragement from the Greek-American community toward these marriages are crucial in maintaining Greek ethnicity in America (Scourby, 1980).

These studies suggest that American born children of immigrants experience increased levels of stress when caught between the pressure of retaining their parents’ Eastern heritage and culture or assimilate into American society (Padilla et al., 1986; Ying, 2002). Because of these difficulties in adjusting, Berry believes that immigrants and their following generation experience acculturation conflicts (1998). On the other hand, Berry along with the collaboration of other theorists and researchers, such as Moskos (1980) and Phinney (1998), make it clear from their published literature that ethnicity when characterized by language, religion, and endogamy, inevitably diminishes across generations (Scourby, 1984, p.126).

Measurement of Acculturation

Acculturation, for various ethnic groups, has been measured with acculturation instruments designed/developed specifically for that ethnic group. Two, of the most frequently measured variables that appear in acculturation instruments are language and religious beliefs (Harris & Verven, 1996; Landrine & Klonoff, 1995; Mendoza, 1989;

Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew & Vigil, 1987). Typically, an acculturation scale is designed to measure specific variables that are characteristic of that particular ethnic group. For example, the African American acculturation scale (Landrine & Klonoff, 1995) examines variables such as religion, interracial attitudes, and preparation and consumption of traditional foods, all of which are pertinent variables in African American culture. For Mexican Americans, variables such as language, religious beliefs and intermarriage are all variables that are considered in their process of acculturating (Mendoza, 1989). Appendix A highlights these frequently measured variables amongst four different acculturation scales.

Sex Role Issues in Acculturation

An acculturation study that was conducted by Shideh Hanassab (1991) examined the correlations between acculturation and attitudes towards sex roles and intimate relationships among young Iranian women. The subjects were seventy-seven Iranian women who ranged in age from 17 to 32 years, and who all lived in Los Angeles, California. Overall, the findings revealed a significant positive correlation between level of acculturation and increased liberal attitude toward sex roles and intimate relationships (Hanassab, 1991). The correlation coefficients between the subjects' acculturation level and premarital sexual attitude was $r = .5105$, $p = .000$; between acculturation level and sexual attitude and sex-role specific for Iranians was $r = .5369$, $p = .000$ (Hanassab, 1991). Interestingly enough, subjects' education level did not have a statistical significance on their acculturation score (Hanassab, 1991).

A research study that explored gender roles in Brazilian immigrant families in the United States was conducted by Sylvia Duarte Dantas DeBiaggi (2002). DeBiaggi's

sample consisted of fifty Brazilian immigrant married couples who resided in the Boston area (DeBiaggi, 2002). All of the couples were “recruited through either a Brazilian minister, a Brazilian radio show, acquaintances, community leaders associated with particular organizations, or through the ‘snow ball’ process” (DeBaggi, 2002, p.61). When examining acculturation levels and testing for gender differences a paired-sample t-test was conducted and the results yielded no significant difference ($t = .78$, $p = .43$) between husbands and wives. For both the husbands and wives a “mid-point” of acculturation was favored. Basically, when given the choice to identify oneself as either American or Brazilian, “half and half” or “both equally” was most frequently chosen by each subject (DeBaggi, 2002, p. 75). “The sample means of males ($M = 42.06$) and females ($M = 42.9$) suggest a mid-point acculturation level in the behaviors measured, indicating a tendency in the sample to consider as important both Brazilian and American cultural aspects of life” (DeBaggi, 2002, p. 75).

Conclusion

Exploring this information with an ethnic individual and examining how his/her beliefs and behaviors influence and shape the individual systemically can assist in formulating more appropriate and beneficial assessment instruments and treatment interventions. There are several acculturation scales that exist for specific ethnic groups, such as, Mexican Americans (Mendoza, 1989), Asians (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987), African Americans (Landrine & Klonoff, 1995) and Greek-Americans (Harris & Verven, 1998).

For example, the African American Acculturation Scale is based on eight theorized dimensions of African American culture (Landrine & Klonoff, 1995). Each

acculturation scale is developed to specifically measure notable attributes of a particular culture (see Appendix A). And although the ethnic groups may vary, there are specific variables, such as, language, religious beliefs and food preferences that overlap throughout all of these acculturation scales.

The process of acculturation is an evolving process that takes place over time and influences more than just the individual. The individual experiencing the acculturation process undoubtedly affects the others with whom he/she interacts. Whether the relationship is between a parent and child, or a husband and wife the relationship itself is one more element that must be explored.

These perspectives about the outcomes of acculturation and its effect on ethnic attitudes and behavior patterns require further investigation, more specifically, how differences in acculturation impact an individual's relationships (Harris & Verven, 1998). Even though specific behaviors and attitudes have been identified among diverse ethnic groups (e.g., Anglo Americans, Greeks and Italians) (Ponterotto et al., 2001), little or no effort has been made to assess how these attitudes and behaviors are specifically distributed within the Greek-American community (Ponterotto et al., 2001).

Three of the most frequently written about variables in the acculturation literature among Greek scholars and researchers (Demos, 1994; Harris & Verven, 1998; Moskos, 1980; Ponterotto et al., 2001) regarding Greek-Americans have been the role of language, religion and gender.

Greek-American Acculturation

Greek Language

Greeks who have immigrated to the United States, known as the first generation, have viewed both their language (Greek) and their religion (Greek Orthodox) as the core of their ethnic identity according to Costantakos (1982) and Kourvetaris (1971). Greek is also spoken in the home on a daily basis. It is not surprising that this ethnic identifier continues to influence and shape succeeding generations (Constantakos, 1982). Although an exhaustive literature review has failed to produce any pertinent research studies that examine the Greek language as a construct, the Greek language as an ethnic identifier is profound (Constantakos, 1982). It is profound in the sense that it is readily reinforced not only on a daily basis at home, but through afternoon Greek language schools, regular trips to Greece, as well as its liturgy in the Greek Orthodox Church.

The Role of the Church

Demos (1994) has coined the phrase of the Greek Orthodox Church being “the major vehicle of Greek ethnicity in the New World” (p.83). The Church has been documented as being the most influential institution for Greek-Americans (Moskos, 1980; Saloutos, 1973), making it difficult to differentiate Greek ethnicity from Greek Orthodoxy. Same faith religion is strongly encouraged by the Eastern Orthodox Church (Moskos, 1980; Schultz, 1979). There are certain sanctions that are implemented deterring religious intermarriage (Moskos, 1980; Schultz, 1979). For example, Schultz (1979) states, “the Greek Orthodox Church prohibits individuals not married in the Orthodox Church from participating in certain sacraments” (p. 204).

According to Moskos (1980), it is estimated that four out of five Greek-Americans also identify themselves to some degree as Greek Orthodox (Demos, 1989; 1994). This estimate is based on “surveys of Greek-Americans in Brooklyn and

Cincinnati that found between 70 and 80 percent of all respondents identified as Greek Orthodox” (Moskos, 1980, pg. 67). This statistic exemplifies the importance of the Greek Orthodox Church in preserving Greek ethnicity.

The Greek Orthodox Church, for many Greek-Americans, is often times an integral piece in maintaining their ethnic identity (Saloutos, 1973). The Greek Orthodox Church also allows a continual reinforcement of its heritage. The Church serves as an institution for Greeks, where many of their life cycle’s milestones (e.g., baptisms and weddings) are recognized and officiated (Moskos, 1980). Although the Church’s primary purpose is to provide Greek-Americans with a spiritual foundation, for many the Church serves a dual purpose. Greeks traditionally have used the Church as the core of their social life (Moskos, 1980).

A social coffee hour in the Greek Orthodox Church’s reception area after each Sunday service is quite common. This weekly event affords parishioners the opportunity to socialize with one another, and possibly forge new relationships. The Greek Orthodox Church also makes it possible for social and cultural events (such as Greek Independence Day, plays and dances) to be carried out (Saloutos, 1973). Greek school, which is typically held at the Church, sets the stage where the Greek language and customs are routinely reinforced. The Greek Orthodox Church as a whole is the center of community life for the majority of Greek-Americans.

Gender Roles

The construct *gender-role* as reported by Sharpe and Heppner (1991), is defined by O’Neil (1981) as “behaviors, expectations, and role sets defined by society as

masculine or feminine which are embodied in the behavior of the individual man or woman and culturally regarded as appropriate to males or females” (p. 323). The assimilation of the gender roles of the host country (in this case, the United States) is one aspect of acculturation. Gender-role acculturation occurs when the dominant culture’s gender-role values affect or change the individual’s perception of masculinity and femininity (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Since gender differences are emphasized in second generation Greek-Americans, based on traditional gender-roles from the Greek-American community women, tend to experience greater pressures than the men to retain a traditional form of ethnicity (Georgas, 1991; Scourby, 1980).

Georgas’ (1991) study investigated family values among 678 subjects living in Greece. Subjects were members of 226 three-person families which were comprised of the mother, father and the adult child (whether it was a son or daughter) (Georgas, 1991, p. 448). Georgas’ findings (1991) revealed that both the male and female children’s values highly correlated with their mother’s roles and values ($p < .001$). Although these findings may not be entirely applicable to first and second generation Greek-Americans due to the geographical, ecological and social factors of his study, Georgas’ findings do highlight the weight that the traditional hierarchical collectivist family system carries and its potential effect on the process of acculturation.

In this respect, Greek couples are similar to Mexican American couples. In a study of one hundred fifty-three families who were randomly selected from a participating health maintenance organization, Flores et al. (2004) found that when reporting marital conflict, one partner’s acculturation level was significantly related to the couples’ level of acculturation. Overall, less marital conflict was found to be reported by

Mexican-identified wives and husbands. Depending on the couples' level of acculturation, Flores et al. (2004) found that the more acculturated the partner was, the less tied he/she was to Mexican cultural script (p. 50).

According to the literature, the intact Greek family unit historically has been patriarchal (Demos, 1989; Kourvetaris, 1971; Scourby, 1984; Tsemberis & Orfanos, 1996). Gender roles have been shaped and organized for Greek ethnic families based on a male dominated system. The family unit continues to be a significant system for Greek- Americans today and influence the way gender roles are prescribed (Demos, 1989; Tsemberis & Orfanos, 1996). A number of writers in the field familiar with Greek culture (Demos, 1989, 1994; Kourvetaris, 1971; Scourby, 1984; Georgas, 1988; McGoldrick & Garcia-Preto, 1984), primarily through their own exposure of being either of Greek heritage or in close contact with it, have observed and researched some poignant features that are characteristic of Greek culture. For example, Demos (1989) states that

The traditional Greek ethnic husband is expected to take primary responsibility for the family's economic needs, respect his wife, show affection to his children, and assume a leadership position in the ethnic community. His wife is expected to take primary responsibility for maintaining a hospitable home, providing for her husband's comfort, and socializing the children, particularly with respect to their ethnic culture (p. 77).

Researchers are continuing to unravel the significant effects that both gender and generation have on the acculturation process. For example, second-generation women are more likely to adhere to traditional expectations of maintaining an ethnic home and abstaining from achievement outside of it, whereas, second-generation men are likely to

strive for success outside the home and to be less concerned with traditional ethnicity (Demos, 1989, p.92). Although Demos has cited works from Charles Moskos (1989), as well as Theodore Saloutos (1973), and has written several articles herself, it is unclear where she has gathered the basis of the information she reports. In her writings Demos also implies that there will be increased mobilization towards an “American” identification as Greek-American women begin to further their education beyond just high school (Demos, 1989; 1994).

Supporting this notion is a study that was conducted by Ponterotto et al. (2001). They examined the relationship of gender and acculturation on attitudes toward counseling in Italian-American and Greek-American college students. Their sample included 46 Italian-American men, 81 Italian-American women, 52 Greek-American men, and 53 Greek-American women (Ponterotto et al., 2001). The findings revealed that for the Greek-American sample, acculturation level and gender attitude toward counseling services were correlated (Ponterotto et al., 2001). For instance, in the higher acculturated group of the Greek-American men and women, it was the Greek-American women ($M = 19.7$, $SD = 3.6$) who proved to be more open in disclosing their personal concerns and scored significantly higher, $t(52) = 2.4$, $p < .05$, than did the men ($M = 17.3$, $SD = 3.6$) (Ponterotto et al., 2001). This may have been a result of feeling more comfortable speaking the English language. As the Greek-American women became more acculturated, their language barrier decreased affording them the opportunity to become more verbal.

Marital Intimacy

Definitions and Models

Intimacy has been documented as being a crucial component of marital relationships (Heller & Wood, 2000; Schaefer & Olson, 1981). “Intimacy” is often interchanged with sexual relationships or perceived as having meanings that imply physical contact (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Intimacy is ambiguous in how it is defined and allows room for assumptions to be made. There has not yet been a consensus in the literature of what specific attributes define intimacy, therefore making it particularly difficult and frustrating in being able to identify and operationally define intimacy. Varying aspects of marital intimacy have been examined and extensively written about, but marital intimacy is consistently described as “a subjective relational experience” (Gold, 1998, p.199). This description allows each individual to define and evaluate intimacy based on their interactions within their intimate relationship (Gold, 1997; Heller & Wood, 2000; Prager & Buhrmester, 1998).

According to Schaefer and Olson (1981), intimacy is defined as “a process and an experience which is the outcome of the disclosure of intimate topics and sharing intimate experiences” (p. 50). Stemming from their definition of intimacy, Schaefer and Olson have identified five specific components that encompass their meaning of intimacy: emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational.

Derived on the premise of give and take theory as well as attachment theory, Wynne (1988) regards intimacy as a “high order relational skill” (Rampage, 1994, p.128). Wynne and Wynne (1986) define intimacy as a subjective experience that is based on trust between two individuals who able to care and nurture one another (Rampage, 1994). Weingarten (1991, 1992), like Wynne and Wynne (1986, 1988), defines intimacy from a postmodern, social constructionist approach stating that each couple narrates its

definition of intimacy based on shared experience(s). According to Cheryl Rampage (1994) Weingarten's definition of intimacy is "people share meaning or co-create meaning and they are able to coordinate their actions to reflect their mutual meaning-making" (p.128). Based on Wynne and Weingarten's definitions of intimacy, Cheryl Rampage (1994) developed her own definition of intimacy as "the experience of personal and relational affirmation and enhancement that derives from interactions demonstrating reciprocal knowledge and validation between partners" (p. 128).

Gottman's definition of intimacy (1979, 1989) is centered on his theory of marital process, which incorporates a range of human experience. Gottman, along with his colleagues Howard Markman and Cliff Notarius (1977), examine marital *process* rather than marital *content* when examining and exploring the ways in which couples relate to one another.

Overall, some of the components that have been noted in the literature as being critical in defining an experience as intimate are the following: that each partner feels fully engaged and empowered in the process, that the experience validates each other and their relationship, that their interaction with one another is very meaningful, and their interaction validates a boundary around their relationship (Prager, 1995; Rampage, 1994; Rusbult, 1983). To date, research on intimacy has been limited by vague definitions of the construct and by sole reliance upon subjective rather than objective indicators of this phenomenon.

Tsemberis and Orfanos' (1996) example of the definition of love makes a poignant point:

When one asks an American couple if they love each other, it is typically understood that one is asking about a set of behaviors that include being intimate, sharing feelings openly and doing things together. If a Greek couple is asked the same question, it is usually interpreted that one is asking about another set of behaviors that includes whether the husband is a good provider and whether the wife is faithful and obedient to him and to her children (p.519).

Definitions of intimacy are, in part, problematic as a result of cultural and gender differences in the valuing of individuation versus collectivism, and for this reason it is difficult to assess the value that different individuals place on intimacy.

Couples Research

Research indicates that shared values and self-disclosure are fundamental to intimacy and are strongly affected by ethnic and cultural norms (Hendrick, 1981; 1988). Ethnic groups can be depicted by the way they value and express self-disclosure individually and in relation to their partner (Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler, 1988; Ponterotto et al., 2001). Research in this area indicates that in order to be satisfied with a relationship, it is equally important not to be manipulative (i.e., deceiving your partner) as it is to be committed and disclosing (Hendrick et al., 1988). Self-disclosure, like intimacy, is established through engaging another individual (Hendrick et al., 1988).

Hendrick's (1981) study examined the effect of self-disclosure and attitude similarity on marital satisfaction. Fifty-one couples from several different churches (e.g., Protestant, Catholic and Jewish) were recruited by their clergy. The couples mean length of marriage was eight years (Hendrick, 1981). Each partner completed five different test instruments. Hendrick's study found a positive relationship between marital satisfaction

and self-disclosure at a significance level of $p < .01$. Hendrick's study also revealed a strong relationship between attitude similarity and marital satisfaction ($p < .01$).

Hendrick believes that her findings are noteworthy in offering variables that can serve as predictors of marital satisfaction.

One aspect of couples research that has been explored has been marital satisfaction. Typically, satisfaction has been considered the dependent variable (Hendrick, 1981; 1988) and process variables (such as intimacy, investment, or neuroticism) have been used to predict relationship satisfaction (Karney & Bradbury, 1997; Murray, Holmes & Griffin, 1996). Literature on relationship satisfaction (particularly, marital satisfaction) has been written (Karney & Bradbury, 1997; Rusbult, 1983; Snyder, 1979). Rusbult (1983) conducted a 7-month longitudinal study that included 17 male and 17 female undergraduates. How rewarding the relationship was contributed significantly to the prediction of satisfaction, but how costly the relationship was did not (Rusbult, 1983). Taking into account that this was a considerably small sample size, the findings must be taken to be tentative and exploratory (Rusbult, 1983). Because the sample was drawn from undergraduate college students it is not necessarily representative of the larger world of mature people in relationships and therefore constricts its generalizability (Rusbult, 1983).

Murray, Holmes & Griffin's (1996) study wanted to examine "the role of positive illusions" and its effect on both dating and marital relationships. Their participants included sixty-nine married couples ($M=30.5$) and ninety-eight dating couples ($M=19.5$). Overall, for both the married and unmarried couples, individuals perceived their partners in a more hopeful light than they perceived themselves. Results found, "that married

individuals evaluated their partners ($M = 6.51$) even more positively than their partners evaluated themselves ($M = 6.24$), $F(1, 74) = 12.46, p < .001$ " (Murray et al., 1996, pg.87). These positive perceptions of one another predicted an increase in the couples' satisfaction level. It must be noted that a shortcoming of this study is operationally defining and differentiating what is perceived as an illusion versus what is real.

Karney and Bradbury (1997) also examined marital satisfaction. They used marital satisfaction as their dependent variable. Karney and Bradbury (1997) collected data from sixty newlywed couples that responded to classified advertisements that ran in several newspapers in the Los Angeles area. The couples who responded were married for an average of 12 weeks, and the husbands yielded an average age of 25.4 years, while their wives average age was 24.0 years (Karney & Bradbury, 1997). White couples made up seventy-five percent of their sample (Karney & Bradbury, 1997). The limitation of researching newlywed couples is that the generalizability of the findings are very limited in that they exclude generalizability to couples who have been married for longer periods of time (i.e., twenty-five years).

Karney and Bradbury's findings emphasized that specific behaviors (i.e., problem-solving) are correlated to changes in marital satisfaction. They found that the level of marital satisfaction is influenced by the individual's feelings about his/her relationship over time (Karney & Bradbury, 1997). Furthermore, it has been noted that separating processes and outcomes in marital relationships can be quite difficult. Similar to the question of "which came first, the chicken or the egg?" it can be problematic in identifying whether intimacy increases marital satisfaction or if marital satisfaction increases intimacy (Karney & Bradbury, 1997; Rusbult, 1983). This makes it all the

more difficult in defining and developing an instrument that can precisely measure the array of variables that influence intimate relationships.

Inter-ethnic Relationships

Couples' ethnicities, whether similar or dissimilar, can often times promote or strain bonding between partners (Heller & Wood, 2000). Heller and Wood (2000) are noted as stating, "Intra-married couples (partners of similar ethnicity) may experience greater intimacy because their common religious and ethnic backgrounds provide a 'language' for communicating and negotiating their differences with less conflict" (p. 242). And although this may be the presumption regarding intra/inter-ethnic relationships, there is little data that supports this notion. Past research involving inter-ethnic couples has focused on small samples, and the data continues to be contradictory. It is still unclear as to whether inter-ethnic relationships provide opportunity for increased intimacy or whether these differences present challenges for couples that may hinder their intimacy (McGoldrick and Garcia-Preto, 1984).

Furthermore, there are two ideas that have influenced the literature regarding inter-ethnic marriages. The first idea contends that, "... inter-ethnic and inter-racial marriages are more likely to experience stress in comparison to mono-ethnic marriages, and secondly, inter-ethnic and inter-racial marriages are also at higher risk for ending in divorce in comparison to mono-ethnic marriages" (Negy & Snyder, 2000, p.294). Minimizing the stress and fostering a more successful union for mono-ethnic marriages is primarily due to the support that the couple typically receives from both family and society (Negy & Snyder, 2000). That frequently is not the case with inter-ethnic and

inter-racial marriages (Negy & Snyder, 2000, p.294; McGoldrick & Garcia-Preto, 1984; Chan & Smith, 1995).

Inter-ethnic marriages may have more difficulty in negotiating the different values and customs these couples bring into their marriages (McGoldrick & Garcia-Preto, 1984). However, despite the reports that there are lower divorce rates among mono-ethnic couples relative to inter-ethnic couples (Crohn, Markman, Blumberg & Levine, 2000; Negy & Snyder, 2000), there is scarce and varying evidence to support this claim (Negy & Snyder, 2000). It must be noted that although lower divorce rates are being claimed, these authors have failed to state what the lower divorce rates are.

For example Negy and Snyder's study (2000) examined relationship satisfaction among the marriages of inter-ethnic and mono-ethnic Mexican-American couples. Their sample included 72 inter-ethnic couples (one partner being Mexican-American), 75 mono-ethnic couples (both partners being Mexican-American), and 66 White couples (both partners being White non-Hispanic). Their study did not yield any statistical significance for any of the three types of marriages being examined (Negy & Snyder, 2000). When Negy and Snyder analyzed the effects of gender on the three types of marriages, they found that gender did not have a significant role in the couples' relationship satisfaction (Negy & Snyder, 2000).

When acculturation was examined in inter-ethnic couples where the wife was Mexican-American, their self-ratings on the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican-Americans (ARSMA; Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980) correlated significantly ($p < .01$), with their scores on the role orientation scale and the dissatisfaction with children assessment scale. In addition, the wives' scores were correlated with their husbands'

scores on the conflict with child rearing assessment, the dissatisfaction with children assessment and the disagreement with finances assessment (Negy & Snyder, 2000). Interestingly, the results for their male counterparts did not find any significant correlations among their scores and their wives scores (Negy & Snyder, 2000). These results are indicative of the strain that women may experience in respect to their marital role when a higher level of acculturation is reached (Negy & Snyder, 1997 & 2000).

On the other hand, a qualitative research study that was conducted by Joanides, Mayhew, and Mamalakis (2002) found that inter-married couples' presenting problems may in fact be linked to their differing ethnicity and religious backgrounds. Included in their study were 202 inter-Christian (marriages between a Greek Orthodox Christian and a non-Orthodox Christian) and inter-cultural spouses (partners from different cultures) (Joanides, et al., 2002). All of the spouses participated in one of 20 focus groups (Joanides, et al., 2002, p.6). In addition to the focus groups, an Interfaith Marriage website had also been set up to serve as a forum where individuals were given the opportunity to offer their feedback regarding the results from the inter-married couples' focus groups (Joanides, et al., 2002). There were a total of 174 respondents whose feedback was considered and included in the outcome of this study (Joanides, et al., 2002). Focus groups implementing open-ended questions were used (Joanides, et al., 2002). The results of their research revealed "thirteen different categories (e.g., negative view of inter-marriage, couples' view of religion, and individual and couple challenges) describing their life's experiences, as well as their challenges as inter-married couples" (Joanides et al., 2002, p.7). These categories only begin to highlight the complexity of inter-ethnic relationships.

Greek-American Couples

Traditionally, inter-ethnic marriages have been frowned upon by first generation Greek-American parents (Schultz, 1979). Although this may be the case, a staggering “62.5% of all marriages, conducted in Greek Orthodox churches are inter-Christian and intercultural”, according to the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America (GOA) (Joanides et al., 2002; p.3). Schultz (1979) interviewed 17 Greek-Americans living in Tucson, Arizona, ranging between 25-85 years of age. Each subject was given the marriage preference test, where they were instructed to arrange slips of paper (that had various ethnic or nationality groups written on each slip), in a vertical array reflecting his/her “ideas of marriage preference” (Schultz, 1979, p. 198). Of the seventeen subjects, fifteen of them placed ‘Greek’ as their first preference for marriage (Schultz, 1979). The remaining two subjects placed ‘Greek’ as their second preference (Schultz, 1979). Although an association was found between preference of marriage and generation it is difficult to determine the strength of the association due to the very small sample size that was recruited.

Greeks marrying someone within their ethnic culture has been strongly encouraged, both overtly and covertly. With succeeding generations, the overt hope of marrying within the ethnic culture has relatively decreased (Demos, 1989; Moskos, 1980). In lieu of these overt and covert demands, the frequency of intermarriages within the Greek Orthodox Church continues to grow (Joanides, Mayhew, & Mamalaki, 2002; Kourvetaris, 1971; Moskos, 1980). According to Joanides et al. (2002) an increase from 46% to 64% has occurred in the past 22 years. This was data collected from the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America Yearbook (2000).

Inter-ethnic marriages appear to be more prevalent as the years pass (Joanides et al., 2002). Both Greek ethnic men and women are, “strongly encouraged to marry within the ethnic boundaries, Greek men are given more freedom with regards to intimacy in non-marital relationships inside and outside the ethnic group” (p.84). Traditional Greek practices have held this double standard out of fear that a woman be left impregnated without marriage and shame her family” (Demos, 1994, p. 85).

Vasilikie Demos (1994) reviewed her data from an earlier survey she had conducted in 1984. Demos utilized two Greek Orthodox Churches, one located in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and the other in Baltimore, Maryland, to access Greek households. Five hundred eighty-four questionnaires of the 1800 that were sent out were sufficiently completed and returned (Demos, 1994). Her findings indicated “a lower rate of intermarriage for the women than for the men” (p.85). The results of her study reported that, “the men’s intermarriage rate was 43 percent compared to the women’s rate at 33 percent married to a non-Greek ethnic” (Demos, 1994, p.85).

Although there has not been much exploration on the effects of Greek intermarriage as it pertains to ethnicity, Demos (1989) has reported that gender typically has an effect on an individual’s ethnicity. For Greek ethnic husbands, their role of carrying out Greek customs and traditions, as well as speaking the Greek language, is not as prevalent as it has been seen with Greek ethnic wives (Demos, 1989).

Although Demos’ study (1994) has indicated that marriage type (intra-ethnic vs. inter-ethnic) plays a significant role in the reproduction of Greek ethnicity, overall, it comes in as a secondary consideration, after generation for Greek immigrants. These

results warrant further investigation, in order to further develop and better understand the complexities of Greek ethnicity in the United States.

Conclusion

The family, along with the Greek Orthodox Church, is critical to the maintenance of Greek ethnic identity from one generation to the next. Greek-Americans greatly value the institution of family. Even today, gender differences continue to have a prominent role within the Greek-American family, from intimate relationships to childrearing (Kourvetaris, 1971). Changing conceptions of gender roles during the acculturation process can be a difficult issue, often times forcing an individual to examine gender roles from two different sets of norms (ethnic culture and dominant culture) (Campbell & Snow, 1992; Ying, 2002).

Undoubtedly, gender-roles are undeniably affected by individuals who are in the process of acculturating. The pull between ethnic gender-roles and the gender-roles of the dominant culture must be negotiated (Campbell & Snow, 1992; Demos, 1989, 1994). The Greek family system is one that is patriarchal. Traditionally, gender roles have been clearly defined. The husband is expected to provide for the family financially, as the wives are expected to take care of their families and home (Demos, 1989, 1994; Scourby, 1980). The dominant culture's values and one's ethnic family history can be contradictory and therefore, create sources of stress and conflict (Campbell & Snow, 1992; Ying, 2002).

In general, the literature continues to use Anglo Americans as the control group for the premise of their research. Other ethnic groups, such as African Americans, Asian Americans, Greek-Americans and Mexican Americans, continue to be used as the

comparison groups. Using Anglo American couples as a barometer to measure other ethnic couples does an injustice to these “other” ethnic groups because their differences and value systems are not recognized as assets, but rather as hindrances to the couples’ marital functioning.

A literature search examining marital dynamics among Greek-American couples did not produce any pertinent studies. One study on Greek-Americans examined acculturation and how cognitive schemas guide intimate relationships (Koutrelakos, (2004). This study’s sample consisted of individuals, not couples, and does not disclose if these individuals were single or married. Overall, this study did find that acculturation does impact intimate relationships (Kotrelakos, 2004). For example, Greek-Americans are more acculturated to an “American way” of individuation when it comes to self disclosure in their intimate relationships. But, on the other hand, self-sacrifice in intimate relationships was embraced with a collectivistic point of reference.

With the exception of this recently published study (Koutrelakos, 2004), there have not been any studies to date that have explored the relationship between acculturation and intimacy in Greek-American couples. The scarce research regarding Greek-American couples and the nature of their relationships makes way for new ground to be forged in this area of research. This research will begin to give scholars, anthropologists, sociologists, and family therapists’ pertinent information on the status of Greek-American couples and their area of need. Appropriate research instruments as well as therapeutic strategies can be developed in order to better serve this population as they negotiate and navigate their couple-hood with their acculturation experience.

CHAPTER 3: REASEARCH QUESTION

Considered as one of America's smallest ethnic groups, little research has examined the marital relationships of Greek-Americans. Exploring the intimacy level between Greek-American husbands and wives is necessary to begin to close the existing gap in couples' research regarding this ethnic population. The current research that exists on acculturation among Greek-Americans is scarce and often times, they are grouped together with other European ethnic groups (for example, Italians). Intimacy, as well as issues of acculturation and egalitarianism in Greek-American marriages has been overlooked. Exploring the ethnics' marital intimacy warrants examination of the individuals' acculturation level and egalitarian perspective within their marital relationship. This research forges new ground in ethnic couples' research.

The main purpose of this study was to gather descriptive data on Greek-American couples' in an attempt to identify pertinent variables that may affect Greek-Americans' marital relationships. In an effort to fulfill this study's purpose, the following questions guided this research: 1) Is there a relationship between an individual's perceived intimacy and his/her level of acculturation to contemporary American society?; 2) Are there differences in perceived levels of intimacy between members of mono- and inter-ethnic couples?; 3) Does gender affect a partner's acculturation level?; 4) Does gender affect a partner's perception of intimacy?; 5) Does gender affect a partner's perception of marital egalitarianism?; 6) Does generation affect a partner's perception of marital egalitarianism?; 7) Does generation affect a partner's perception of intimacy?

Conceptual Definitions

In this study six conceptual areas were investigated. These areas included (1) generational status, (2) acculturation level, (3) perceived intimacy within the dyad, (4) perceived egalitarianism within the dyad, (5) gender, and (6) partner's shared ethnicity.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census (1973) defines *generation in America* as: the *first generation* being born outside of the United States (U.S.); *second generation* as being born within the U.S., and having one or both parents being born outside of the U.S.; and *third generation* as being born in the U.S., as well as having both parents born in the U.S.

Acculturation is defined as, "the extent to (and process through) which ethnic minorities participate in the cultural traditions, values, beliefs, assumptions, and practices of the dominant society (acculturated), or remain immersed in their own culture (traditional/less acculturated)" (Verven, 1996, p.18).

Intimacy is defined as focusing on the "process" of the marital relationship. David Olson (1981) differentiates an *intimate relationship* from an *intimate experience*. "An *intimate experience* is a feeling of closeness or sharing with another in one or more of the five areas (emotional, social, intellectual, sexual, and recreational); it is possible to have intimate experiences with a variety of persons without having or developing an intimate relationship" (p. 50). An *intimate relationship* is "generally one in which an individual shares intimate experiences in several areas, and there is the expectation that the experiences and relationship will persist over time" (p. 50).

Egalitarianism is defined as the belief of equality by both partners, especially in the decision making process.

Gender is defined as male or female.

Partner's ethnicity is defined as how an individual ethnically identifies him/herself (e.g., Greek-American). A *mono-ethnic couple* is defined as two partners who share similar ethnic backgrounds and common religious beliefs (McGoldrick and Garcia-Preto, 1984). *Inter-ethnic couple* is defined as two partners who do not share similar ethnic backgrounds and common religious beliefs (McGoldrick and Garcia-Preto, 1984).

<u>Exogenous Variable</u>		<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>
Gender	→	Acculturation	Perception of Marital Intimacy
Generation	→	Partner's Ethnicity	Perception of Marital Egalitarianism

Figure 2
Variables for this study

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to describe Greek-American couples' marital relationships. Information was gathered on the attributes of mono-ethnic Greek-American couples, as well as inter-ethnic couples (where only one partner is Greek-American). The similarities and/or differences between the groups in terms of acculturation, egalitarian views, and intimacy were explored.

Participants

Participants recruitment was limited to the South New Jersey area, more specifically, to Atlantic County. There are large Greek communities in this area, hence making accessibility to this sample very practical. All of the participants resided in South Jersey and were members of a Greek Orthodox Church. The participants had been in attendance during a Greek Orthodox liturgy service on a Sunday morning where the pastor invited parishioners to volunteer for this study. The data collection time frame was extended on several occasions due to the low response rate.

Although every measure was taken to ensure participants of this close community comfort and anonymity in the data collection process, it was very difficult recruiting volunteers. For this reason, once data had been collected for the first sixty couples, the data collection process was finished.

The sample included sixty couples (60 male participants; 60 female participants). Other studies (e.g., Karney & Bradbury, 1997; Hendrick, 1981; Hendrick, Hendrick, & Adler, 1988) examining various dynamics between couples were similar in sample size. All of the participants were heterosexual married couples. The participants were divided into three groups: Greek participants who were married to Greeks, Greek participants

married to non-Greeks, and non-Greek participants married to Greeks. All three groups were compared to one another for similarities and differences in acculturation level, perceived intimacy, egalitarian roles and demographics. The participants came from a broad sample in terms of generational status, socioeconomic background, education, age and years married. These demographic variables served as covariates.

Couples were able to participate regardless of whether they had children or not. The inclusion criteria required that one partner or both partners be of Greek descent, and that both partners were fluent in reading and writing English. Exclusion criteria included: participants who were not married, participants living with their parents, as well as participants who were under the age of eighteen.

Procedure

Recruitment was implemented through verbal announcements made in a Greek Orthodox Church, as well as “word of mouth.” The announcements were specific and explained in detail information regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria that was needed in order to participate (see Appendix B). During the announcement a contact number was given for potential participants to contact the investigator if further inquiry regarding the research study was needed. Several different dates and times were announced informing potential participants when and where they would need to come in order to fill out the designated survey instruments. Even though the pastor made verbal announcements on a regular basis, recruitment of participants was slower than anticipated. Data collection sessions varied in size.

The data collection took place in the recreational hall of Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox church in Egg Harbor Township, Atlantic county. Specific tables were

arranged and reserved in the church's hall for participants. Permission had been granted by Father Dr. George Liacopulos (see Appendix C) to use the Church's community center as the setting to collect this data. As the participants arrived, they signed a consent form (see Appendix D). Because the survey instruments were filled out anonymously, no other sign in sheet was implemented.

Each participant received a packet that contained a personal demographic data questionnaire (see Appendix E), and the following self administered questionnaires: The Greek-American Acculturation Scale (GAAS) (see Appendix F), the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIAM) (see Appendix G), the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR) (see Appendix H), and the Egalitarian Questionnaire (EQ) (see Appendix I). Subjects took approximately 25-30 minutes to complete their entire packet.

Reliability was potentially threatened by participants responding in a "socially desirable" manner. In an attempt to limit this potential threat, anonymity was discussed prior to participants filling out the instruments and specific measures were taken for anonymity to be ensured. For example, participants' signed consent forms were kept separate from the instruments they filled out. In addition, the instruments were coded by a number and corresponding letters in order to identify which partners were a couple. Couples were able to choose their own packets as they were pre-coded and in envelopes. The researcher explained the instructions to each couple(s) (see Appendix J). Members of each couple sat separately from one another in order to control for partners collaborating on their responses. Each participant's answers were not shared with his/her partner.

Beverages and light food were offered buffet style, serving as incentive for participants to take their time and be relaxed as they completed their packets. Each participant could get up from the table at anytime, whether they needed to use the restroom or get more refreshments. At times the noise level was not conducive to participants being able to concentrate on filling out their packets, due to the fact that the room was being shared with the remaining congregation, who were not participating. While participants filled out their packets the researcher stood nearby to answer any potential questions that participants may have had. When each participant finished filling out his/her packet he/she put the completed packet in the envelope with his/her partner's completed packet. The envelope was then sealed and put into a box that was provided.

At the end of each data collection, once all of the couples were finished filling out their packets, the researcher debriefed the couples as a group (see Appendix K). During the debriefing the researcher answered any questions the participants had and thanked them for their participation. In the event that couples needed further assistance after the investigator's debriefing, the investigator provided participants with Father Dr. George Liacopulos' contact information. Father Dr. George Liacopulos served as a referral that was made available for each individual/couple. The referral enabled the individual/couple to seek out therapeutic mental health services if needed.

Several Sunday mornings were designated to collect the data. This study ran minimal risk. Trouble recruiting couples to volunteer for this study was the main obstacle that this study encountered.

Measurement

Acculturation-Greek Identity

Following Berry's (1980, 1990) schematic of acculturation, the researcher used two assessment instruments to measure each participant's level of acculturation. Greek-American acculturation is operationally defined in regard to how immersed a participant is in the Greek ethnicity, unrelated to age, gender, income or education (Harris & Verven, 1996). The Greek-American Acculturation Scale (GAAS) (Harris & Verven, 1996) was used to measure each participant's acculturation level. The GAAS was developed by Allen C. Harris and Renee Verven (1996) to examine acculturation as it pertains to Greek-Americans. This scale consists of 56 items divided into seven subscales (Greek language, traditional Greek religious beliefs and superstitions, Greek school attendance, Greek media, ethnic identity and interracial attitudes, preparation and consumption of traditional Greek foods, and inter-marriage and dating behavior) of Greek culture. The subscales capture the different constructs that are relevant to Greek heritage.

Subjects were asked to respond to these items using a 7-point Likert scale. High agreement with each statement (e.g., responding with a seven), indicated a more traditional Greek perspective. Responding with a lower score, such as one, indicated a less traditional Greek perspective. Each subject received a mean score based on the responses of the GAAS. Overall for the GAAS and its seven subscales' alpha coefficients ranged from .19 to .97.

The GAAS was developed based on Landrine & Klonoff's (1994) African American Acculturation Scale, and Mendoza's (1989), Cultural Life Style Inventory. The GAAS's reliability ranges from .70 to .92. The reliabilities for each subscale are as

follows: Greek language = .92; traditional Greek religious beliefs and superstitions = .81; Greek school attendance = .88; intermarriage and dating behavior = .91; contact with the Greek mass media = .87; ethnic identity/practices and interracial attitudes = .82; preparation and consumption of traditional Greek foods = .70 (Verven, 1996). GAAS's split-half reliability ($r = .94, p = .0001$) indicates that the items in the Greek-American Acculturation Scale measure acculturation in a consistently reliable manner (Harris & Verven, 1996).

Factor analyses have previously been conducted on the scale's items ($N=56$) to examine the "dimensional structure of the measure" (Verven, 1996, p. 51). "Product-moment correlations were then computed between the modified Greek Family Values Scale (Georgas, 1989) and the Greek-American Acculturation Scale" (Verven, 1996, p. 51). The correlation was significant ($r = .5062, p < .001$), indicating that "the higher a subject's score on the Greek Family Values Scale (more traditional Greek family values), the higher his/her score on the Greek-American Acculturation Scale (less acculturated)" (Verven, 1996, p. 51).

The GAAS was scored on the instrument as a whole, as well as scored on each of its subscales. The scores of the GAAS were scored in terms of continuous variables. Once the data was collected the three groups' (Greeks married to Greeks, Greeks married to non-Greeks, and Non-Greeks married to Greeks) responses were compared.

To date, the Greek-American Acculturation Scale has been used in two studies, one of which the developer herself, Renee Verven, had conducted for a Master's thesis paper. The other implementation of the Greek-American Acculturation Scale was for a doctoral thesis. In her study Verven found that GAAS was unrelated to income, age, or

education, but found that participant's gender did appear to be related to his/her level of acculturation. Verven's findings also revealed that even after three generations of living in the United States, Greek-Americans were not fully assimilated into contemporary American society.

An acculturation score was determined by computing the means for each dimension. The higher one's score was, the more acculturated he/she was to Greek culture. A lower score indicated a participant was less acculturated to Greek culture.

Acculturation-Americanization

The second instrument that was used was a modified version of the Vancouver Index of Acculturation. (Appendix L is the permission that was granted to use the VIA for this study). The original VIA was developed by Andrew G. Ryder, Lynn E. Alden, and Delroy L. Paulhus (2000) to measure the extent of an individual's ethnic and mainstream acculturation (see Appendix M). This scale included twenty items which were divided into three subscales measuring work, values and relationships (Ryder et al., 2000). Subjects were to respond using a 9-point Likert scale. This scale was modified for this study prior to being administered, and included eleven items, all of which subjects scored using a 7-point Likert scale in order to maintain consistency with the other instruments being used. The alpha coefficient for the overall scale was .92.

Since the VIA was modified to capture only the degree of mainstream acculturation, ethnic acculturation was measured by the GAAS. The revised instrument was an 11-item questionnaire. The Vancouver Index of Acculturation Modified (VIAM) instrument did not have subscales. The instrument indicated how acculturated a participant was to mainstream America. The revised Vancouver Index of Acculturation

Modified (VIAM) was scored similarly to the GAAS. The participant's scores were scored in terms of continuous variables. Once the data was collected, all three groups were compared.

Egalitarianism

Egalitarianism was operationally defined by a brief questionnaire that was developed by the researcher. An instrument that addressed this specific area in examining couples' marital relationships could not be found, and therefore the marital Egalitarian Questionnaire (EQ) was created. The participants answered the 16-item questionnaire using a seven-point likert scale. The subscales included questions that pertain to participant's affection, engagement in their marriage, and openness. The last question (number seventeen) was open-ended. The likert scale ranged from 'not applicable' to 'strongly agree'. The EQ questionnaire captured participants' perception of egalitarianism in his/her marriage. It illustrated whether a participant held more of a "Greek traditional" (defined as a patriarchal) or an "American" (defined as more flexible family roles) perspective in terms of gender roles.

The Egalitarian Questionnaire (EQ) was scored to get a mean for the overall scale, as well as its three subscales. These scores were compared similarly to the GAAS and the VIAM.

Intimacy

Intimacy was operationally defined as the measurement of realized intimate experiences as it is perceived by each partner. The Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR) was developed by Mark T. Schaefer and David H. Olson (1981) as a tool for therapists to assess and compare perceived intimacy with desired intimacy in

couples. This scale consists of 36 items which are divided into six subscales, allotting six items per subscale. The six subscales include emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, intellectual intimacy, recreational intimacy and conventionality. The conventionality subscale measures the extent to which subjects are responding in a socially desirable manner (Olson & Schaefer, 2000). Instead of the original 5-point Likert scale, subjects rated their responses on a 7-point Likert scale in order to maintain consistency in scoring among all the scales used in this study. The likert scale ranged from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. For this study only the scores of emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, intellectual intimacy and recreational intimacy were used. The conventionality subscale was omitted because it was not examining one of the intimacies.

The instrument's validity, with the exception of five items, is adequate. Each subscale has six items. The PAIR's alpha reliability for each subscale was as follows: emotional (.75), social (.71), sexual (.77), intellectual (.70), recreational (.70), conventionality (.80) (Olson & Schaefer, 2000). The participant's *perceived* score is compared with their *expected* score by a formula that Olson & Schaefer have devised. The participant's responses are plotted on a specific data sheet and then their score is able to be computed. Taken directly out of Olson & Schaefer's PAIR manual (2000), Appendix N has the detailed process of how a participant's "now" score is related to their "ideal" score.

Appendix O is the permission that was granted from the developers of the PAIR instrument allowing their instrument to be used for the purpose of data collection. No test-retest data has been found. For the purpose of this study a mean score of each

partners' perception of intimacy "now" (based on the husband's "now" PAIR score and his wife's "now" PAIR score) was calculated. Partners' "ideal" perception of intimacy was not further explored for this study. The focus of this study was to capture couples' perception of intimacy "today", not how they ideally would like their relationship to be. The PAIR was scored by computing the mean for the overall scale as well as each of its five subscales. The scores were then compared among the three groups of participants.

The GAAS, VIAM questionnaire, the EQ questionnaire, and the PAIR were the four instruments that were used to measure the concepts of acculturation, egalitarianism and intimacy. In addition to these four instruments, a personal demographic data sheet was used to collect information regarding gender, socioeconomic status, generation and other demographic information for each participant. This personally created demographic data sheet was implemented in order to gather information not otherwise captured by the four assessment instruments that were used. These variables were assessed in order to observe any possible relationships between the variables being measured (level of acculturation, egalitarian views and perception of intimacy) and possible confounding variables. The demographic data (e.g., age, gender, socioeconomic status, etc.) was also very helpful in capturing a more detailed description of this study's sample.

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

The statistical analysis was as follows:

1. The PAIR and the VIAM's rating scales were modified from 5 and 9-point Likert scales to 7-point Likert scales prior to data collection in order to maintain consistency among the scoring procedures for all four instruments.
2. ANOVAs were computed for the four covariates (education, generation, income and number of children) whose data was collected categorically. A t-test was computed for gender. Correlations were computed for the remaining two covariates (age and years married) whose data was collected as continuous data. The results of the correlations for both age and years married were not definitive, therefore, they were re-coded from continuous variables to categorical variables to further clarify the information. Based on the percentages of thirds, age and years married were collapsed into new categories. This new categorical data was divided into subgroups of low, medium and high (e.g., age; younger, middle and older participants).
3. In order to test for internal reliability, Cronbach's Alpha was computed for each scale and its respective subscales. This procedure identified which items on each scale were highly correlated, as well as which items had a low correlation. Items with a low correlation were deleted; this procedure increased reliability.
4. Correlations were computed for all four scales and their subscales. Because the correlations indicated that there was statistical significance among Greek subjects with Greek partners, Greek subjects with non-Greek partners, and non-Greek

subjects with Greek partners and the assessment instruments (GAASR, VIAM, PAIR and EQR), further analysis was conducted to examine these relationships.

5. ANOVAs were computed for each scale in order to compare the Means among the three groups. The ANOVAs indicated if there were any differences between the groups and each scale.
6. Regressions were computed for all four scales and the covariates. Subscales were also run with the covariates. Two additional regressions were computed for the EQR and the PAIR as the dependent variable- in addition to the covariates, both acculturation scales (GAASR and VIAM) served as independent variables.

Univariate Statistics

One hundred twenty subjects participated in this study, fifty percent of whom were males and fifty percent of whom were females. Each subject was part of a heterosexual couple. All sixty of the couples were married, with fifty percent mono-ethnic, where both partners were of Greek descent, and the remaining fifty percent inter-ethnic, where only one partner was of Greek descent. Subjects were 29% (N=35) first generation, 44.2% (N=53) second generation and 26.7% (N=32) third generation. The subjects ranged in age from 22 to 84 years, with a mean age of 44 years (sd=14.28). Overall, almost half (48.3%) of the 120 subjects reported having two children (range 0-4). Subjects were married for an average of 8-18 years, with a median household income of \$61,000-\$100,000. Educationally, subjects averaged completing up to some college.

The subjects were then divided into three groups. The first group was comprised of Greek subjects married to partners who were also of Greek descent (mono-ethnic

couples), the second group included Greek subjects married to non-Greek partners and lastly, non-Greek subjects who were married to partners of Greek descent made up the third group. In the mono-ethnic group, thirty of the partners were male and thirty of the partners were female. For the second group, 13 of the partners were Greek males and 17 of the partners were Greek females. The third group consisted of 17 non-Greek males and 13 non-Greek females (See Table 1.2). The following tables provide a description of what subjects looked like when they were demographically compared as three groups on all seven of the covariates (age, gender, generation, number of children, years married, household income and generation).

Table 1.1
Age of Subjects by Groups

Age	Greek w/ Greek Partner		Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner		Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
22-35	17	28.3	12	40.0	13	43.3
36-51	17	28.3	11	36.7	11	36.7
52-84	25	41.7	7	23.3	6	20.0
missing data	1	1.7	0	0	0	0

Table 1.2
Gender of Subjects by Groups

Gender	Greek w/ Greek Partner		Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner		Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
males	30	50.0	13	43.3	17	56.7
females	30	50.0	17	56.7	13	43.3

Table 1.3
Generation of Subjects by Groups

Generation	Greek w/ Greek Partner		Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner		Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
First	27	45.0	7	23.3	1	3.3
Second	30	50.0	20	66.7	3	10.0
Third	3	5.0	3	10.0	26	86.7

Table 1.4
Children of Subjects by Groups

Children	Greek w/ Greek Partner		Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner		Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0	10	16.7	4	13.3	5	16.7
1	0	0	2	6.7	3	10.0
2	30	50.0	14	46.7	14	46.7
3	14	23.3	8	26.7	6	20.0
4	5	8.3	2	6.7	2	6.7
missing data	1	1.7	0	0	0	0

Table 1.5
Years Married of Subjects by Groups

Years Married	Greek w/ Greek Partner		Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner		Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-7	16	26.7	13	43.3	13	43.3
8-18	17	28.3	10	33.3	10	33.3
19-50	26	43.3	6	20.0	7	23.3
missing data	1	1.7	1	3.3	0	0

Table 1.6

Household Income of Subjects by Groups

Household Income	Greek w/ Greek Partner		Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner		Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
0-\$60,000	18	30.0	9	30.0	9	30.0
\$61,000-\$100,000	24	40.0	9	30.0	12	40.0
more than \$100,000	18	30.0	12	40.0	9	30.0

Table 1.7

Level of Education of Subjects by Groups

Educational Level	Greek w/ Greek Partner		Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner		Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
completed up to high school	20	33.3	5	16.7	4	13.3
completed some college	14	23.3	10	33.3	9	30.0
college graduate	18	30.0	11	36.7	12	40.0
Masters/post graduate, MD,JD	8	13.3	4	13.3	5	16.7

Scale Reliabilities*GAAS*

The original Greek-American Acculturation Scale (GAAS) had fifty-six items and seven subscales. In reviewing the GAAS's subscales, the subscale on "intermarriage and

dating behaviors” was deleted from the GAAS because of the subscale’s low alpha coefficient (.19). After making this change to the GAAS, the scale was renamed the Greek-American Acculturation Scale Revised (GAASR) (see Appendix P).

The internal reliability for the Greek-American Acculturation Scale Revised (GAASR) was .97 (51 items). The GAASR’s subscales’ reliabilities were as follows: ethnic identity ($\alpha = .86$, 14 items), Greek language ($\alpha = .90$, 15 items), Greek media ($\alpha = .84$, 4 items), Greek school ($\alpha = .88$, 6 items), preparation and consumption of Greek traditional foods ($\alpha = .71$, 4 items), and religious beliefs ($\alpha = .74$, 8 items). (See appendix Q for reliabilities and appendix R for factor analysis.)

VIA

The original Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA) scale consisted of twenty items and three subscales. The VIA was originally developed to measure ethnic culture (odd numbered items) versus mainstream culture (even numbered items). Since the GAASR had been selected to measure Greek ethnic culture, the VIA scale was modified in order to eliminate duplication of items (and dimensions) that had already been captured by the GAASR. For this reason, only the mainstream culture items were selected in order to capture subjects’ acculturation to mainstream American culture. The VIA was renamed the Vancouver Index of Acculturation Modified (VIAM). The VIAM did not contain subscales. The Likert scale used was also modified from a 9-point scale to a 7-point scale, in order to maintain scoring consistency with all of the scales that were used in this study. The VIAM consisted of eleven items and had an alpha coefficient of .92 (see appendix S for reliabilities and appendix T for factor analysis).

PAIR

The Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR) scale's internal reliability was high ($\alpha = .92$). Although the overall reliability was high, three of the PAIR's five subscales were relatively low. The subscales reliabilities were as follows: emotional intimacy ($\alpha = .82$, 6 items), intellectual intimacy ($\alpha = .67$, 6 items), recreational intimacy ($\alpha = .54$, 6 items), sexual intimacy ($\alpha = .79$, 6 items), and social intimacy ($\alpha = .63$, 6 items). The PAIR and its subscales were not modified (see appendix U for reliabilities and appendix V for factor analysis).

EQ

The Egalitarian Questionnaire (EQ) was originally developed with sixteen items and had an alpha coefficient of .51. Because of the low alpha score, the EQ was modified using factor analysis (see appendix W) and scale reliabilities (see appendix X) in order to increase the instrument's alpha coefficient. As a result of the factor analysis, five items were deleted from the original scale, increasing the scale's alpha coefficient to .73. The revised EQ was then named the Egalitarian Questionnaire Revised (EQR). The EQR was comprised of eleven items, and three subscales. The subscales were; affection ($\alpha = .81$, 3 items), engagement ($\alpha = .54$, 4 items), and openness ($\alpha = .73$, 4 items).

Inferential Statistics

ANOVAs

One-way ANOVAs were computed to further explore the differences between all three groups of couples. The following tables show the means (M) and standard deviations (sd) for the covariates and all four scales; the Greek-American Acculturation

Scale Revised (GAASR), the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIAM), the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR), and the Egalitarian Questionnaire Revised (EQR), as well as each scale's respective subscales.

As seen in Table 3.1, Greek subjects with Greek partners, on average, scored higher in both age and years married. This group was older and married longer than the other two groups, but scored similar on number of children. Greek subjects with non-Greek partners and non-Greek subjects with Greek partners scored similarly to one another in regards to all three covariates.

Table 3.1

Covariates	Greek w/ Greek Partner	Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner	Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner
age	M=47.32years(sd=15.26)	M=41.07years(sd=12.33)	M=40.13years(sd=12.84)
children	M=2.07(sd=1.13)	M=2.07(sd=1.08)	M=1.90(sd=1.13)
years married	M=19.84years(sd=14.88)	M=12.72years(sd=11.38)	M=13.63years(sd=12.08)

Gender

An ANOVA was run for each of the scales by gender for all of the subjects as one group, and no statistical significance was found. An ANOVA was then computed for subjects by sub-groups (Greek subjects with Greek partners, Greek subjects with non-Greek partners and non-Greek subjects with Greek partners) and none of the results yielded statistical significance.

Generation

An ANOVA was also computed for each of the scales by generation and did yield statistical significance for each instrument when the sample was looked at as one group. Subjects examined as one group by generation for the GAASR yielded a statistical significance at the .000 level, for the VIAM, subjects statistical significance was at .007, and for the PAIR, level of statistical significance was .028 and for EQR statistical significance was .031.

When further analyzed as three sub-groups, the GAASR and the EQR were the only two instruments that yielded statistical significance. (see Table 3.2). Subjects with Greek partners received statistically significant scores in comparison to the two other groups. More specifically it was first and second generation Greek subjects with Greek partners who received statistically significant scores on the GAASR. For the EQR Greek subjects with non-Greek partners received statistically significant scores at the .013 level (see Table 3.3). The VIAM and the PAIR did not yield any statistically significant results by generation as a group or as subgroups.

Table 3.2

GAASR & Generation	N	Mean	Sig.
Greek w/ Greek partner			
1 st	27	5.2466	.012
2 nd	30	4.8442	
3 rd	3	4.3782	
Greek w/ non-Greek partner			
1 st	7	4.4179	.069
2 nd	20	4.0167	
3 rd	3	2.7821	
Non-Greek w/ Greek partner			
1 st	1	2.0962	.796
2 nd	3	2.4359	
3 rd	26	2.1380	

Table 3.3

EQR & Generation	N	Mean	Sig.
Greek w/ Greek partner			
1 st	27	4.7737	.052
2 nd	30	5.1417	
3 rd	3	6.0879	
Greek w/ non-Greek partner			
1 st	7	4.8623	.013
2 nd	20	5.7091	
3 rd	3	4.5152	
Non-Greek w/ Greek partner			
1 st	1	5.8182	.689
2 nd	3	5.0909	
3 rd	26	4.9346	

GAASR

As seen in Table 3.4, the Greeks with Greek partners scored statistically significantly (at the .01 level) different than the Greek subjects with non-Greek partners and non-Greek subjects with Greek partners on the GAASR overall, as well as the GAASR's six subscales. A post hoc test was computed that yielded this difference. The higher the mean number, the more acculturated subjects were to Greek culture. Although the Greek subjects with the non-Greek partners score was relatively high, it was not of statistical significance. The non-Greek subjects with Greek partners' scores' were not statistically significant.

Although Greek subjects with non-Greek partners and non-Greek subjects with Greek partners did have statistically significant scores, a trend in the means can be observed. There was a steady decrease in the mean score on the GAASR and all of its subscales starting from the mono-ethnic group over to the non-Greek subjects with Greek partners group.

Table 3.4
GAASR and Subscales (range 0-7)

	Greek w/ Greek Partner	Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner	Non-Greek w/Greek Partner
GAASR	M=5.00(sd=.65)**	M=3.99(sd=1.04)	M=2.17(sd=.71)
Greek Language (GL)	M=4.83(sd=.76)**	M=3.44(sd=1.04)	M=1.80(sd=.81)
religious beliefs (RB)	M=4.97(sd=.85)**	M=4.24(sd=1.06)	M=2.67(sd=.87)
Greek school (GS)	M=5.99(sd=1.10)**	M=4.72(sd=1.71)	M=2.36(sd=1.13)
Greek media (GM)	M=4.65(sd=1.68)**	M=3.15(sd=1.55)	M=1.63(sd=1.12)
ethnic identity (EI)	M=4.71(sd=.63)**	M=3.89(sd=1.05)	M=1.96(sd=.64)
preparation of foods (PCF)	M=5.25(sd=1.29)**	M=4.77(sd=1.90)	M=2.78(sd=1.70)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

VIAM

Similar to the GAASR a trend can be observed with the VIAM and each of the three groups of subjects. Here, the mean score gradually increased among the three groups as can be observed in Table 3.5. There was no statistical significance in any of the three groups with how they scored on the VIAM. As seen with the GAASR, the concept of bi-culturalism was also supported with the VIAM scores. Although none of the groups differed statistically significantly, the mono-ethnic group did score lower than the other two groups, indicating that the Greek subjects with Greek partners, were less acculturated to American culture, than the other two groups.

Table 3.5

VIAM (range 0-7)

	Greek w/ Greek Partner	Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner	Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner
VIAM	M=5.28(sd=1.28)	M=5.84(sd=1.25)	M=5.93(sd=1.62)

PAIR

When each group was examined on how they scored on the PAIR and its five subscales, there was no statistical significance between any of the three groups of couples. In looking at Table 3.6, speculation of some sort of pattern or support of an idea or theory cannot be made given the subjects' scores. There was no logical account for the scores that were yielded on the PAIR.

Table 3.6

PAIR and Subscales (range 0-7)

	Greek w/ Greek Partner	Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner	Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner
PAIR	M=5.10(sd=.82)	M=5.18(sd=.99)	M=4.97(sd=.90)
emotional (Emt)	M=5.39(sd=1.14)	M=5.32(sd=1.38)	M=5.10(sd=1.22)
social (Soc)	M=4.98(sd=1.12)	M=5.23(sd=1.07)	M=4.87(sd=1.10)
sexual (Sex)	M=5.44(sd=1.13)	M=5.39(sd=1.06)	M=4.95(sd=1.49)
intellectual (Intel)	M=4.80(sd=1.09)	M=5.19(sd=1.17)	M=5.13(sd=.97)
recreational (Rec)	M=4.92(sd=.83)	M=4.98(sd=1.22)	M=5.03(sd=1.00)

EQR

There was no statistical significance with any of the three groups on how they scored on the EQR and its subscales. The only observation that was note worthy in Table 3.7 was that the Greek subjects with non-Greek partners was the only group that scored slightly higher on the EQR overall, as well as two of the EQR's subscales (engagement and affection).

Table 3.7

EQR and Subscales (range 0-7)

	Greek w/ Greek Partner	Greek w/ Non-Greek Partner	Non-Greek w/ Greek Partner
EQR	M=5.02(sd=.97)	M=5.39(sd=.89)	M=4.98(sd=1.00)
Engagement	M=4.61(sd=1.42)	M=4.99(sd=1.29)	M=4.59(sd=1.16)
Affection	M=5.28(sd=1.61)	M=6.14(sd=1.24)	M=5.45(sd=1.66)
Openness	M=5.23(sd=1.31)	M=5.23(sd=1.23)	M=5.02(sd=1.34)

Correlations

Greek Subjects with Greek Partners Group

There was a statistically significant negative correlation between the GAASR and the VIAM scales at the .05 level (see Table 4.1). This indicated that the GAASR and the VIAM were measuring two different variables. The GAASR scale was significantly negatively correlated with the PAIR. The more acculturated to Greek culture subjects were, the lower they scored on the intimacy scale. A statistically significant positive correlation (at the .05 level) was indicated between the VIAM and the EQR scales; this indicated that the more acculturated to American culture subjects were, the more egalitarian they were in their marriages. Lastly, there was a statistically significant

positive correlation between the PAIR and the EQR scales (at the .01 level). This correlation suggests that a positive relationship exists between intimacy and egalitarianism for this group.

Table 4.1

	GAASR	VIAM	PAIR	EQR
GAASR	1	-.275*	-.367**	-.108
VIAM	-.275*	1	.238	.308*
PAIR	-.367**	.238	1	.689**
EQR	-.108	.308*	.689**	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Greek Subjects with Non-Greek Partners Group

Similar to the Greek subjects with Greek partners group, the PAIR was statistically significantly correlated with the EQR (at the .01 level) for this group of subjects (see Table 4.2.). Although the GAASR and the VIAM did not result in statistical significance for this group, there was a positive correlation.

Table 4.2

	GAASR	VIAM	PAIR	EQR
GAASR	1	.253	-.003	.000
VIAM	.253	1	.183	.004
PAIR	-.003	.183	1	.747**
EQR	.000	.004	.747**	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Non-Greek Subjects with Greek Partner Group

There was no correlation between the GAASR and the VIAM (see Table 4.3).

The GAASR was statistically significantly negatively correlated with both the PAIR and the EQR at the .01 level. Once again, as seen with the two previous groups (Greek subjects with Greek partners and Greek subjects with non-Greek partners), the PAIR was statistically significantly correlated with the EQR at the .01 level.

Table 4.3

	GAASR	VIAM	PAIR	EQR
GAASR	1	-.016	-.528**	-.370**
VIAM	-.016	1	-.229	-.163
PAIR	-.528**	-.229	1	.810**
EQR	-.370*	-.163	.810**	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Regressions

Dependent Variables Regressed on Covariates

GAASR

The GAASR was the dependent variable and was regressed on the seven covariates (age, education, gender, generation, children, income and years married) all of which were the independent variables. As seen in Table 5.1, Greek subjects with Greek partners received statistically significant scores overall but not for any individual covariates. Greek subjects with non-Greek partners and non-Greek subjects with Greek partners did not receive scores with any statistical significance.

Table 5.1

New Groups Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Greek w/ Greek Regression	6.720	7	.960	2.759	.017
Greek w/ non-Greek Regression	8.413	7	1.202	1.074	.417
non-Greek w/ Greek Regression	5.149	7	.736	1.605	.194

VIAM

The VIAM served as the dependent variable and was regressed on the seven independent variables (age, education, gender, generation, children, income and years married). Table 5.2 presents how each group scored. As seen with the GAASR, Greek subjects with Greek partners scored overall statistical significance, but there was not one independent variable that contributed significantly or was predictive of how subjects scored on the VIAM.

Table 5.2

New Groups Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Greek w/ Greek Regression	23.668	7	3.381	2.382	.035
Greek w/ non-Greek Regression	7.963	7	1.138	.621	.732
non-Greek w/ Greek Regression	34.809	7	3.274	1.224	.338

PAIR

The PAIR was the dependent variable and was regressed on the seven covariates (age, education, gender, generation, children, income and years married). Although the overall significance level for all three groups is statistically significant, there are different explanations as to what covariates may have been significant predictors. For the Greek subjects with Greek partners, education (.023) was the only covariate that was positively statistically significant. Although the overall model was significant for Greek subjects with non-Greek partners, there was not one covariate that significantly contributed. As for the non-Greek subjects with Greek partners', children (.024) and age (.001) were the two positively significant covariates that contributed.

Table 5.3

New Groups Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Greek w/ Greek Regression	10.938	7	1.563	2.774	.016
Greek w/ non-Greek Regression	13.199	7	1.886	2.601	.046
non-Greek w/ Greek Regression	13.032	7	1.862	4.574	.004

EQR

The dependent variable, the EQR was regressed on the seven covariates (age, education, gender, generation, children, income and years married). Greek subjects with Greek partners scored statistically significant overall, but individually, none of the covariates scored statistical significance. For the non-Greek subjects with Greek partners the contributing covariate was age (.006), it was positively statistically significant.

Table 5.4

New Groups Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Greek w/ Greek Regression	14.075	7	2.011	2.502	.028
Greek w/ non-Greek Regression	7.628	9	1.030	1.713	.166
non-Greek w/ Greek Regression	13.756	9	1.623	2.822	.034

Dependent Variables Regressed on Independent Variables and Covariates

In addition to the two previous regressions (of the PAIR and the EQR as the dependent variables) the independent variable instruments (GAASR and VIAM) were added to the seven covariates. Although there was statistical significance overall for one of the groups (Greek subjects with Greek partners), there were not any independent variables by themselves that contributed statistical significance.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

Research Questions

This study set out to answer several questions regarding the differences between mono-ethnic and inter-ethnic Greek subjects. This study compared 60 mono-ethnic Greeks with 30 inter-ethnic Greeks and their 30 non-Greek partners, all of whom completed a packet of assessment instruments measuring level of acculturation, perceived intimacy and egalitarian roles. A difference was found between mono- and inter-ethnic Greek subject groups regarding this study's first question, "Are there differences between an individual's perceived intimacy due to differing levels of acculturation to contemporary American society?" Level of acculturation for the mono-ethnic group was predictive of how he/she would score on the PAIR and the EQR.

The second question, "Are there differences in perceived levels of intimacy between members of mono-ethnic couples and inter-ethnic couples?" produced no significant differences between the mono- and inter-ethnic groups in their perceptions of intimacy. Similarly, the questions "Does gender affect a partner's acculturation level?", "Does gender affect a partner's perception of marital intimacy" and "Does gender affect a partner's perception of marital egalitarianism?" did not yield any significant differences among men and women and their level of acculturation, as well as their perceived level of intimacy or egalitarianism. The question "Does generation affect a partner's perception of marital egalitarianism?" yielded statistically significant data for Greek subjects with non-Greek partners, indicating overall that this group's generational status had an effect on marital egalitarianism, but with no discernable pattern as it went from first to third

generation. Lastly, the question “Does generation affect a partner’s perception of intimacy?” did not produce any statistically significant data.

There may be several reasons for this study’s results. One is the possibility of a Type II error. Five out of the seven proposed questions were unable to defeat the null hypothesis (that there was no difference between Greeks and non-Greeks or Greek subjects of any generation). Not finding enough significance to defeat the null hypothesis raises two questions: First, was the researcher wrong in believing that there was going to be a difference among these subjects, therefore proposing the wrong questions? Or alternatively, was there no difference found because the methodology, particularly sample size, was not sufficient?

GAASR

The GAASR was as a valuable and accurate instrument for this study. The GAAS was originally developed to be used on Greek-Americans, but this study demonstrated that the GAASR may also be administered to non-Greek individuals who are married to Greek partners. Non-Greek individuals who have been exposed to Greek heritage, culture and customs through their partners are also candidates for taking the GAASR in order to measure the non-Greek partner’s integration (or not) of Greek culture.

The GAASR presented a methodological limitation because of its lack of implementation in Greek-American couples’ research. Although the original GAAS was used in a limited amount of cited literature (e.g., Masters’ thesis, a dissertation and the

instrument's development), the GAASR has not been used in research other than this study.

The ANOVAS that were computed demonstrated that the mono-ethnic group was the only group to score statistically significantly different from the other two groups. This was expected in terms of Greek participants with Greek partners scoring higher on the GAASR than their Greek counterparts and their non-Greek counterparts. The results of this ANOVA demonstrated in all three groups that a decrease in ethnic acculturation appears to be influenced by the composition of the couple (e.g., mono- or inter-ethnic). There appears to be a connection for Americanization that is different for the mono-ethnic group than it is for the Greek subjects with non-Greek partners, suggesting that Greek subjects are more Americanized if they have selected a partner outside of their ethnic group.

As the results were further dissected by computing ANOVAs by generation and gender for each of the three groups, some statistically significant data were found. The means indicate that there was a dramatic difference between generations within each of the three groups in the predicted direction. For example, the first generation Greek subjects whose partners were Greek scored higher on the GAASR than the second generation and the second generation scored higher than the third generation. These findings support Berry's concept of assimilation. First and second generation Greek-American subjects with Greek partners appear to be in the early stages of assimilating to American culture as opposed to the third generation Greek-American subjects who did not score statistical significance. There was statistical significance with the EQR and generation when subjects were observed as one group, but upon further examining the

subjects by subgroups (Greek subjects with Greek partners, Greek subjects with non-Greek partners and non-Greek subjects with Greek partners), only Greek subjects with non-Greek partners scored statistically significant, indicating a more egalitarian perception of their marriage than the other two subgroups. Of this sub-group, it was second generation subjects that scored statistically significant. It was difficult to speculate with these results because no consistent pattern had emerged among any of the three subgroups. Gender did not account for any statistically significant difference. Statistical significance might have shown up if the sample size were larger.

Correlations demonstrated a statistically significant difference for the mono-ethnic group between the GAASR and the VIAM. This correlation was small enough ($-.275$, $p < .05$ level) to suggest that the GAASR was looking at a different aspect of acculturation than the VIAM. A much higher negative correlation would have been expected if these acculturation dimensions were unidimensional. This correlation was supportive of Berry's model of acculturation (Berry 1979, 1980) that suggests that aspects of acculturation may operate independently of one another and therefore warrant being investigated separately.

A statistically significant correlation between the GAASR and the VIAM was not the outcome for the Greek subjects with non-Greek partners group; in fact, there was a slight positive correlation that was approaching statistical significance. This correlation also supported the observation that was made with the mono-ethnic group, which indicated that the GAASR and the VIAM are measuring different acculturation variables. Statistical significance was not found nor anticipated between the GAASR and the VIAM for the non-Greek with Greek partners group.

When the GAASR was regressed on demographic covariates, the outcome data indicated overall statistical significance for the mono-ethnic group only. There were no individual covariates that were statistically significant, which may be due to the fact that there are seven covariates, each contributing some significance, but not enough to be singled out.

VIAM

As seen in the ANOVA that was computed for the VIAM, none of the three groups were statistically different in their level of Americanization, nor was a pattern discernible.

As previously mentioned, the VIAM and the GAASR were negatively correlated (at the .05 level) for the Greek subjects with Greek partners group. The VIAM can be most helpful if used by researchers in conjunction with other ethnic acculturation scales (e.g., the African American Acculturation Scale, Landrine & Klonoff, 1995 and the Mexican American Acculturation Scale Mendoza, 1989). This will assist the researcher in not only capturing one's unique ethnic acculturation but the level of acculturation to the host country. There was no comparison done in assessing ethnic culture between the VIAM and the GAASR in this study. Therefore, the researcher was unable to evaluate whether a unique ethnic instrument (such as the GAASR) would do a better job than a general one (such as the original VIA) on capturing/measuring one's ethnic identity.

For the two inter-ethnic groups, when correlations were computed, their acculturation issues were independent of their outcome measures (PAIR and EQR). This was not the case for the mono-ethnic group; the VIAM had a statistically significant

correlation with the EQR, indicating that the more acculturated to American culture these subjects were, the more egalitarian they appeared to be in their marriages.

Similarly to the GAASR, the regression model for the VIAM on demographic covariates indicated overall statistical significance for only the mono-ethnic subject group. There were no individual covariates that were statistically significant. This again, may be due to the fact that there are seven covariates, each contributing some significance, but not enough to be singled out.

PAIR

Olson and Schaefer's (1981) claim of reliability coefficients was different from what this study yielded. In this study the researcher found slightly higher reliabilities for both the emotional (.82) and sexual intimacy (.79) subscales, versus Olson and Schaefer's .75 and .77, respectively. However, the researcher found lower reliabilities for social (.63) and intellectual (.67) intimacies' versus Olson and Schaefer's .71 and .70 respectively. A moderately lower reliability for recreational intimacy (.54) was found in this study versus Olson and Schaefer's reliability of .70.

One possibility for these differences can be the sample size that was used. Olson and Schaefer's sample size consisted of 192 married couples, whereas this study only examined 60 married couples. Further investigation is needed in order to better account for these discrepancies.

When the PAIR was regressed on all of the covariates, all three groups indicated overall statistical significance. For the mono-ethnic group education was the only covariate that was indicative of how this group would score on the PAIR. The Greek

subjects with non-Greek partners group did not have any single covariate that was statistically significant. And, for the non-Greek subjects with Greek partners' group, children (.024) and age (.001) were two predictors of how this group scored on the PAIR.

It appeared that these statistical significances were random differences. Previous statistical tests that were computed did not identify these particular covariates unique and statistically significant for either of these subgroups.

EQR

The EQR was specifically developed for this study and has not been used in any other research studies; hence, the issue of validity was raised. The EQR had a high correlation with the PAIR for all three groups indicating good concurrent validity. Both may be viewed as measures of an Americanized view of egalitarianism and intimacy in couples.

When the EQR was regressed on the seven covariates as independent variables, the Greek subjects with Greek partners group and the non-Greek subjects with Greek partners group both scored statistically significant. The non-Greek subjects with Greek partners group was the only group that had a covariate (age) contribute statistical significance. Interestingly, when the covariates were controlled for, age did not show up statistically significant for non-Greeks, but rather for Greek subjects in mono-ethnic marriages. Because of the inconsistencies in the outcome data it makes it difficult to interpret the meaning (if any) of these results for both groups. The second model of regressions (dependent variables regressed on independent variables and covariates) that

were computed did not change anything that was not already identified in the first models of regression.

Factor Analysis and Reliabilities

When a factor analysis was computed for the GAASR the results of the items loaded differently than what was reported by one of the instrument's developers, Renee Verven (1996). The GAASR did not load as well as Verven (1996) had reported. Six subscales were yielded in this study in comparison to Verven's (1996) seven subscales. It appears from this factor analysis that the GAASR can be further modified to be a more concise instrument. The reliabilities overall were very similar on almost all of the subscales with one exception. On the subscale "intermarriage and dating behavior" there was a significant discrepancy between Verven's (1996) reliability of .915 and this study's reliability of .188. This is quite odd considering that all of the other six subscales scored relatively similarly. It is difficult to guess what and how this difference is accounted for.

The VIAM factored into two components. This was different from the three factors (work, values and relationships) that the authors of the instrument had found. This probably occurred because the VIAM implemented only eleven out of the original twenty items. The VIAM's reliability overall was high and would not have increased had any of the eleven items been deleted. This instrument has been demonstrated to be both reliable and valid.

The factor analysis for the PAIR yielded similar subscales to that of its developers Olson and Schaefer (2000). The six subscales that were identified in the PAIR by Olson and Schaefer were confirmed by this factor analysis. The PAIR's overall reliability was

high and, similarly to the VIAM, Cronbach's Alpha would not have increased had any of the items been deleted. The reliabilities for the subscales differed slightly from the reliabilities that Olson and Schaefer (2000) reported. The only speculation that can be made by the researcher is that this study's sample frame influenced the instrument's reliability.

The factor analysis for the EQR factored into three subscales. Since this was a newly developed instrument this was an exploratory factor analysis that yielded strong subscales. The scale reliability for the original EQ was low. As a result, several items needed to be deleted. Although the scale reliability for one of the EQR's subscales was low, the factor loading was high. This may have occurred because of the low number of items in the subscale.

Limitations

This study's generalizability was compromised due to its sample size. Sample size is a contributing factor for a Type II error, hence indicating that the methodology of this study may not have been sufficient enough to find more statistically significant outcome data. This study may be too small in size to generalize to the majority of mono-ethnic and inter-ethnic Greek-American individuals across the country.

The methodological limitation of where and how this data was collected may have influenced this study's findings. The presence of the researcher and setting may have influenced subjects to respond in a socially desirable manner. This study captured only one sample frame, meaning that all of the subjects came from one referral source. All of the subjects belonged to the same Greek Orthodox Church and the majority of the

subjects also belonged to that specific Greek community in suburban southern New Jersey. The demographic location of where the data was collected may not represent or capture the perspectives of Greek-Americans living in metropolitan and rural areas. A larger, more diverse geographical sample would have increased this study's generalizability. In addition, this study did not account for Greek-Americans and their partners who do not attend the Greek Orthodox Church or who are not involved with the Greek Orthodox Church's extracurricular activities.

There are several things that could have been done differently in order to improve this study overall. The sample frame could have been broadened beyond the Greek Orthodox Church. Advertisements in local Greek newspapers and the local Greek grocery store could have been posted. The data collection site could also have been more neutral (e.g., school or county recreational center). Finally, the internet could have also been used as a resource to both recruit subjects and collect data from subjects.

Although a concerted effort was made to ensure that all ethical concerns were considered and addressed, this study raised an unforeseen ethical concern. Because the data collection occurred in a Greek Orthodox Church's hall, many of the subjects knew one another. As word of mouth spread among the Greek Orthodox Church community that volunteers were needed for a research study, individuals began to communicate misinformation to one another. One couple in particular began to communicate to other potential couples that recruitment was seeking out couples to answer questions about their "sex life". This study, through word of mouth, was deemed, "the sex survey". An interesting phenomenon had transpired. As subjects were filling out their packets, non-participants stood nearby to either observe subjects from a distance as they filled out their

packets or speculate about what the packets entailed. After several data collection dates, it became increasingly difficult to recruit volunteers.

Although it is difficult to say for certain whether word of the “sex survey” hindered participants or not, it was hard to ignore the significant decrease in participation once this misinformation was circulated. Even though none of the subjects had indicated any concerns regarding confidentiality or otherwise to the researcher, a more secluded, neutral site where subjects could have filled out their packets without the scrutiny of other parishioners would have improved this study. Because there was not any follow-up with subjects, it is difficult to know for certain what subjects would have liked to be different.

Unanticipated changes

There were two changes that occurred in this study that were not anticipated. This study set out to examine couples’ perception of intimacy. Due to the method that was used to collect this data, it had to be reported as an individual’s perception of intimacy within different kinds of couples (Greek subject with Greek partner, Greek subject with non-Greek partner and non-Greek subject with Greek partner.)

Secondly, the data collection process took much longer than expected. One month was the anticipated data collection length, but it took four months to collect all of the data that was needed. It is from these unanticipated changes and from this study overall that much can be learned. It is simple to identify and state the shortcomings of this research study, but complex to identify specifically what may have directly

contributed to this outcome data. It is with speculation and hindsight that this study allows room for future studies to be conducted with methodological improvements.

Implications for research

Flexibility/or rigidity of a couple's gender roles are variables that must be examined in the process of acculturation. For example, the lack of equivalency in job opportunities can have a profound effect on not only Greek-Americans, but other ethnic couples as well. Wives may be able to earn more money than their husbands due to the kinds of jobs that they are able to attain, thereby setting up a reverse gender dynamic from what couples were accustomed to in their country of origin (where the husband was the expected "breadwinner"). It is easy to speculate with this scenario that immigrants would be more likely to be rigid than their succeeding generations, but it is only with the development of more accurate acculturation instruments that flexibility/rigidity can be further investigated.

In addition to gender dynamics, acculturation is also difficult to measure and assess accurately in terms of differentiating between loyalty to one's ethnic culture and increased acculturation to the host culture. For example, more likely to be seen with a Greek-American woman married to non-Greek male, it may appear externally that the wife has an increased level of acculturation to the host culture (e.g., not speaking Greek to her children, not participating in Greek Orthodox rituals, etc.) when in fact, her choices/behaviors may be a reflection of her acculturation to Greek culture (e.g., honoring and accommodating her husband).

Intimacy is a construct that has been difficult to define. The construct for intimacy may be different for individuals depending on their level of acculturation. This makes it extremely challenging for researchers to develop instruments that capture the uniqueness of ethnic groups undergoing the process of acculturation.

Further research investigating the construct of intimacy for Greek-Americans and other ethnic groups is encouraged. The development and implementation of Americanized intimacy instruments have been the barometers used to measure ethnic intimacy. Although many of these measures may capture the dimensions of intimacy characteristic of many ethnic groups, further examination is warranted.

Body language and non-verbal communication are additional dimensions that were not examined in this study because it was quantitative. It may be possible that from a qualitative study these dimensions could influence the research findings. Qualitatively, a researcher would be able to observe and code the non-verbal communications (e.g., the rolling of a partner's eyes when he/she is speaking) between Greek-American couples and find a different story about their marriage than the story that they present.

The EQR was developed for this study. It investigates a new dimension of marital life. The instrument has implications for considering non-traditionalist perspectives (e.g., same gender couples). Further use and comparisons must be made with the EQR in order to accurately determine this instrument's validity. The EQR did correlate very highly with the PAIR. This suggests that the two of them may represent complementary dimensions.

Lastly, trust/mistrust issues that retrospectively may have come up in this study are another theme that is often characteristic of Greek-Americans and other ethnic groups. Couples may not have responded truthfully or may have not participated in the study for fear of not trusting what or how the information would be used. It is for this reason, that couple and family researchers must work diligently at gaining the Greek-American couple's trust in order to fully engage them in the research process.

There are several other components (such as language barriers, privacy/disclosure and medication), in addition to the ones previously mentioned, that have not been examined in this study, but are recommended for future investigation.

Implications for couple and family therapists

It is imperative that the couple and family therapist recognize his/her own limitations and biases regarding couples with ethnically different cultures than that of the therapist. Therapists must be informed with some basic knowledge of the ethnicity with which his/her client/couples presents.

Family therapists must be sensitive and astute in being able to identify some of the more common themes for Greek-American couples that are also pertinent in other ethnic cultures. Since the Greek culture historically, as with many other ethnic cultures, has been male dominated, family therapists must be sensitive and non-assuming when discussing gender roles with married couples. A concerted effort should be made by the therapist not to impose dominant culture gender roles or offend the couple by dismissing or criticizing their current gender roles. Exploring and understanding personal definitions

of gender role in the context of cultural definitions and level of acculturation must be done with care.

Similarly, couple and family therapists need to be aware that the constructs of intimacy, and therefore how a partner may define satisfaction in their marriage, may be different for partners depending on their level of acculturation. Asking open-ended questions and having the Greek-American couple describe their own perceptions of marital intimacy will give the couple and family therapist a better understanding of what role intimacy plays within the dyad. For Greek-American couples unable to respond to open-ended questions, more direct non-assuming questions may have to be asked.

When working with Greek-American couples the family therapist must have a sense of how acculturation impacts each partner of the couple, as well as its effect on their marriage. For example, divorce is often perceived by Greek couples as an “Americanized” act. On the contrary, the Greek cultural expectation is one of “sticking it out” whether or not he/she is fulfilled in the marriage. It would be important for the couple and family therapist to understand and explore this expectation.

Ethnic couples may come into therapy with reservations. For male Greeks, pride may get in the way and they may enter treatment with reluctance. Seeking “outside help” for marital issues is often times perceived as failure. On the other hand, for female Greeks, fear of verbalizing or expressing emotions openly, and minimizing the couple’s marital problems may be an issue. Through personal experience, “saving face” and maintaining “good” appearances is a common practice for Greeks in general, hence

making it more challenging for researchers to accurately assess, not only Greek-American couples, but other ethnic cultures that hold the same beliefs.

Depending on the stage of the life cycle, one pertinent issue that comes up for Greek-American couples, as well as other ethnic couples, is the care of their aging parent(s). It is frequently expected by first generation Greeks that they will be cared for by their child (ren) as they grow older. Second generation couples must contend with the unspoken obligation and expectation of caring for their elderly parents/in-laws. This difficulty of the “sandwich generation” may be a problem in a society where these things are more institutionalized than left in the hands of family.

The role of the family is another important aspect for therapists to consider. Young adult children who may want to move away from home to go to college or live on their own in order to gain independence, may be met with resistance from Greek-American parents. As Greeks have ascribed to a “collectivistic” approach, the pull or desire that Greek-Americans may experience towards an “individualistic” lifestyle that is perceived as “American” may cause conflict within the couple/family. Engaging the couple/family in a dialogue about what “moving out” means for each member of the couple/family and assisting the couple/family through this meaning making process will allow each member to be heard and develop a new meaning (if needed) to replace what was originally thought of as negative meaning.

The role of the extended family is also one that is very valuable in Greek culture as well as many other ethnic cultures. In couple and family therapy the role of the extended Greek family must be considered. Typically, Greek grandparents have a

tremendous involvement/influence in their grandchildren's lives. Not involving or allowing grandparents to be involved or included in their grandchildren's/ adult children's lives may be perceived as "American behavior". It is with care that the family therapist assists the couple in negotiating and asserting the boundaries that best works for the couple and their family.

Conclusion

To date, there has not been a study that has examined perceived intimacy and acculturation in Greek-American couples. This study raises pertinent questions concerning how Greek-American couples relate to one another when either one or both partners experience the process of acculturation. Although small in its size, this study can be used as a guide in assessing and considering issues of acculturation and intimacy among mono- and inter-ethnic couples of diverse cultures. This study only begins to highlight the complexity of attempting to understand mono- and inter-ethnic couples. This study has focused on just a few of the many different variables that must be considered and further researched in ethnic couples.

Developing a strength-based clinical approach that integrates sensitivity and the uniqueness of each couple, including what each partner brings to the marriage, is the scaffolding therapists can use in helping assess and treat the needs of ethnic couples who are attempting to create and build their future together in their new host country.

List of References

- Andujo, E. (1988). Ethnic identity of trans-ethnically adopted Hispanic adolescents. *Social Work, 33*, 531-535.
- Athens, L. (1996). Migration and religion. *Migration World Magazine, 23*(3), 32-35.
- Barnes, G. G. (1994). Commentary on "power, gender, and marital intimacy." *Journal of Family Therapy, 16*, 139-142.
- Ben-Ari, A., & Lavee, Y. (2004). Cultural orientation, ethnic affiliation, and negative daily occurrences: A multidimensional cross-cultural analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 74*(2), 102-111.
- Berry, J. W. (1979). Research in multicultural societies: Implications of cross-cultural methods. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 10*(4), 415-434.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Berry, J.W. (1980). Social and cultural change. In H.C. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), Handbook of cross-cultural psychology. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Berry, J. W. (1990) Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), Cross cultural perspectives. Lincoln: Nebraska University Press.
- Berry, J. W. (1998). Acculturative stress. In P.B. Organista, K. M. Chun, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Readings in ethnic psychology (pp. 117-122)*. New York: Routledge.
- Berry, J. W., & Kim, U. (1988). Acculturation and mental health. In P.R. Dansen, J.W. Berry, & N. Satorius (Eds.), *Health and cross-cultural psychology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Campbell, J. L., & Snow, B. M. (1992). Gender role conflict and family environment as predictor's of men's marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 6, 84-87.
- Chan, A. Y., & Smith, K. R. (1995). Perceptions of marital stability of Black-White intermarriages. In C.K. Jacobson (Ed.), American families: Issues in race and ethnicity. New York: Garland.
- Costantakos, C.M. (1982). Ethnic language as a variable in subcultural continuity. In H.J. Psomiades & A. Scourby (Eds.), The Greek American community in transition. New York: Pella Publishing Co., Inc.
- Crohn, J., Markman, H. J., Blumberg, S. L., Levine, J. R. (2000). Fighting for your Jewish marriage: Preserving a lasting promise. San Francisco: Josse-Bass.
- Cuellar, I., Harris, L. C., & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 199-217.
- DeBiaggi, S. D. (2002). Changing gender roles: Brazilian immigrant families in the U.S. New York: LFB Scholarly Pub.
- Demos, V. (1989). Maintenance and loss of traditional gender boundaries in two Greek Orthodox communities. *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora*, 16, 77- 93.
- Demos, V. (1994). Marital choice, gender, and the reproduction of Greek ethnicity. In R. Mehra (Eds.), Ethnic women: A multiple status reality. New York: General Hall.
- Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1996). Individualistic and collectivistic perspectives on gender and the cultural context of love and intimacy. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49, 53-69.
- Flores, E., Tschann, J. M., Marin, B. V., & Pantoja, P. (2004). Marital conflict and acculturation among Mexican American husbands and wives. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority and Psychology*, 10(1), 39-52.

- Georgas, J. (1988). An ecological and social cross-cultural model: The case of Greece. In *Indigenous Cognition: Functioning in Cultural Context*. J.W. Berry et al. (eds.) pp.105-123.
- Georgas, J. (1991). Intrafamily acculturation of values in Greece. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 22(4), 445-457.
- Georgas, J., Berry, J. W., Shaw, A., Christakopoulou, S., & Mylonas, K. (1996). Acculturation of Greek family values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(3), 329-338.
- Ghaffarian, S. (1998). The acculturation of Iranian immigrants in the United States and the implications for mental health. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(5), 645-654.
- Gold, J. (1997). Gender and marital intimacy. *Family Journal* 5(3), 199-203.
- Gordon, M.M. (1964). Assimilation in American life. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gottman, J.M. (1979). *Marital Interaction: Experimental investigations*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Gottman, J.M., Markman, H., & Notarius, C. (1977). The topography of marital conflict: A sequential analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 39, 461-477.
- Gottman, J.M., & Krokoff, L. J. (1989). Marital interaction and satisfaction: A longitudinal view. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 57(1), 47-52.
- Hanassab, S. (1991). Acculturation and young Iranian women: Attitudes toward sex roles and intimate relationships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 19(1).
- Harris, A. C., & Verven, R. (1998). Acculturation as a determinant of Greek-American family values. *Psychological Reports*, 83, 1163-1172.

- Harris, A. C., & Verven, R. (1996). The Greek-American acculturation scale: Development and validity. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 599-610.
- Heller, P. E., & Wood, B. (2000). The process of intimacy: Similarity, understanding and gender. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 24(3), 241-252.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1981). Self-disclosure and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 1150-1159.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 93-98.
- Hendrick, S. S.; Hendrick, C., & Adler, N.L. (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, Satisfaction, and staying together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (6), 980-988.
- Humphrey, C. R., & Louis, H. B. (1973). Assimilation and voting behavior: A study of Greek Americans. *International Migration Review*, 7(1), 34-45.
- Ibrahim, F. A., & Schroeder, D. G. (1990). Cross-cultural couples counseling: A developmental, psychoeducational intervention. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 21, 193-205.
- Joanides, C., Mayhew, M., & Mamalakis, P. M. (2002). Investigating Inter-Christian & Intercultural couples associated with the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America: A qualitative research project.
- Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1997). Neuroticism, marital interaction, and the trajectory of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 1075-1092.
- Kourvetaris, G. A., (1971). First and second generation Greeks in Chicago: An inquiry into their stratification and mobility patterns. Athens: National Center for Social Research.

- Kourvetaris, G. A. (1971). Patterns of generational subculture and intermarriage of the Greeks in the United States. *International Journal of sociology of the Family*, 34-48.
- Koutrelakos, J. (2004). Acculturation of Greek Americans: Change and continuity in schema guiding intimate relationships. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39(2), 99-105.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1998). Psychological impact of biculturalism. In P.B. Organista, K. M. Chun, & G. Marin (Eds.), Readings in Ethnic Psychology. New York: Routledge.
- Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. (1995). The African American acculturation scale II: Cross validation and short form. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 21, 124-152.
- La Roche, M., & Maxie, A. (2003). Ten considerations in addressing cultural differences in psychotherapy. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 34(2), 180-186.
- Liem, R., Lim, B. A., & Liem, J. H. (2000). Acculturation and emotion among Asian-Americans. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 6(1), 13-31.
- Makedon, A. (1989). The social psychology of immigration: The Greek-American experience. Retrieved March 28, 2004, from internet Access: <http://webs.csu.edu/~amakedon/articles/GreekAmerican.html>
- McGoldrick, M., & Garcia-Preto, N. (1984). Ethnic intermarriage: Implications for therapy. *Family Process*, 23(3), 347-364.
- Mendoza, R. H. (1989). An empirical scale to measure type and degree of acculturation in Mexican-American adolescents and adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 372-385.
- Mendoza, R. H., & Martinez, J. L., Jr. (1981). The measurement of acculturation. In A. Baron, Jr. (Eds.), Explorations in Chicano Psychology. New York: Praeger.

- Monahan, T. (1970). Are intermarriages less stable? *Social Forces*, 48, 461-473.
- Moskos, C. (1989). Greek Americans: Struggle and success. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Moskos, C. D., Jr. (1980). Greek Americans: Struggle and success. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Moss, B. F., & Schwebel, A. I. (1993). Defining intimacy in romantic relationships. *Family Relations*, 42, 31-37.
- Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., & Griffin, D. W. (1996). The benefits of positive illusions: Idealization and the construction of satisfaction in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 79-98.
- Neff, J. A., & Hoppe, S. K. (1992). Acculturation and drinking patterns among U.S. Anglos, Blacks, and Mexican Americans. *Alcohol & Alcoholism*, 27, 293-308.
- Negy, C., & Snyder, D.K. (2000). Relationship satisfaction of Mexican American and non-Hispanic white American interethnic couples: Issues of acculturation and clinical intervention. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 26(3), 293-304.
- Negy, C., & Snyder, D.K. (1997). Ethnicity and acculturation: Assessing Mexican-American couples' relationships using the Marital Satisfaction Inventory-Revised. *Psychological Assessment*, 9, 414-421.
- Olson, D. H., & Schaefer, M. T. (2000). Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships Manual. Life Innovations. Inc. Minneapolis, MN.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Male sex role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 9(2), 61-80.
- Organista, P.B., Chun, K. M., & Marin, G. (Eds.). (1998). Readings in ethnic psychology. New York: Routledge.

- Ortiz, V., & Acre, C. H. (1984). Language orientation and mental health status among persons of Mexican descent. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 6, 127-143.
- Padilla, A.M., Alvarez, M., & Lindholm, K. J. (1986). Generational status and personality factors as predictors of stress in students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 8, 275-288.
- Phinney, J.S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 499-514.
- Phinney, J. S. (1998). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults. In P.B. Organista, K. M. Chun, & G. Marin (Eds.), Readings in ethnic psychology (pp. 73-99). New York: Routledge.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Rao, V., Zweig, J., Reiger, B. P., Schaefer, K., Michelakou, S., Armenia, C., & Goldstein, H. (2001). The relationship of acculturation and Gender to attitudes toward counseling in Italian and Greek American college students, *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7(4), 362-375.
- Prager, K. J. (1995). The psychology of intimacy. New York: Guilford.
- Prager, K. J., & Buhrmester, D. (1998). Intimacy and need fulfillment in couple relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(4), 435-469.
- Rampage, C. (1994). Power, gender, and marital intimacy. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 16, 125-137.
- Rankin, R., & Maneker, J. (1987). Correlates of marital duration and black-white intermarriage in California. *Journal of Divorce*, 11(2), 51-67.
- Ross, R. A., Cottrell, A. B., St-Cyr, R., & Rawkins, P. (Eds.). (1980). The mobilization of collective identity: Comparative perspectives. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 101-117.
- Ryder, A.G., Alden, L.E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head to head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(1), 49-65.
- Sager, C., & Hunt, B. (1989). Intimate partners: Hidden patterns in love relationships. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Saloutos, T. (1973). The Greek Orthodox Church in the United States and assimilation. *International Migration Review*, 7(4), 395-407.
- Schaefer, M. T., & Olson, D. H. (1981). Assessing intimacy: The PAIR inventory. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 17, 47-60.
- Schultz, S. L. (1979). Marriage preferences and ethnic boundaries: The Greek-American case. *International Journal of Sociology*, 9(Jul-Dec), 197-208.
- Schwertferger, M. (1982). Interethnic marriages and divorces in Hawaii: A panel study of 1968 first marriages. *Marriage and Family Review*, 5, 49-60.
- Scourby, A. (1980). Three generations of Greek Americans: A study in ethnicity. *International Migration Review*, 14(1), 43-52.
- Scourby, A. (1984). The Greek Americans. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender role conflict, and psychological well being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 323-330.
- Simon, A. (1979). Ethnicity as a cognitive model: Identity variations in a Greek immigrant community. *Ethnic Groups*, 2, 133-153.

- SinghaRoy, D. K. (2004). Peasant movements in post-colonial India. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.
- Silverstein, M., & Chen, X. (1999). The impact of acculturation in Mexican American families on the quality of adult grandchild-grandparent relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(1), 188-198.
- Snyder, D. K. (1979). Multidimensional assessment of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41, 813-823.
- Sodowsky, G. R., & Plake, B. S. (1992). A study of acculturation differences among international people and suggestions for sensitivity to within-group differences. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 71, 53-59.
- Solsberry, P.W. (1994). Interracial couples in the United States of America: Implications for mental health counseling. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 16, 304-317.
- Suinn, R. M., Khoo, G., & Ahuna, C. (1995). The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity scale: Cross-cultural information. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 23, 139-148.
- Suinn, R., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity acculturation scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47(2), 401-407.
- Tsemberis, S. J., & Orfanos, S. D. (1996). Greek families. In M. McGoldrick, J. Giodano, & J.K. Pearce (Eds.), Ethnicity and family therapy (pp. 517-529). New York: Guilford Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1973). Census of the population: Subjects Reports. Statistical abstract. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2005). Retrieved June 2007. Access: <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/sf3.pdf>.

- Virtanen, K. (1981). Immigration adaption to new environments: A view from the sending country. *Finnish Americana*, 4, 104-112.
- Verven., R. (1996). An intergenerational study of the family communication environment of Greek-Americans. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Illinois, Illinois, Chicago, USA.
- Vlachos, E.C. (1968). The assimilation of Greeks in the United States: With special reference to the Greek community of Anderson, Indiana. Athens: Center for Social Research.
- Weingarten, K. (1991). The discourses of intimacy: Adding a social constructionist and feminist view. *Family Process*, 30, 285-305.
- Weingarten, K. (1992). A consideration of intimate and non-intimate interactions in therapy. *Family Process*, 31, 45-59.
- Wynne, L. (1988). An epigenetic model of family process. In C. Falicov (ed.), Family transitions: Continuity and change over the life cycle. New York: Guilford.
- Wynne, L. C., & Wynne, A. R. (1986). The quest for intimacy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 12, 383-394.
- Ying, Y. (2002). The effect of cross-cultural living on personality: Assimilation and accommodation among Taiwanese young adults in the United States. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 72(3), 362-371.
- Zheng, X., & Berry, J. W. (1991). Psychological adaptation of Chinese sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, 26, 451-470.

Appendix A
Overlap of Variables in Various Acculturation Scales

	Greek-Americans	African-Americans	Mexican-Americans	Asian-Americans
Greek-Americans		religious beliefs, superstitions, interracial attitudes, preparation & consumption of traditional foods	language, religious beliefs, intermarriage	reading & writing, ethnic interaction, ethnic identity, food preferences
African-Americans	religious beliefs, superstitions, interracial attitudes, preparation & consumption of traditional foods		religious beliefs & practices, socialization	cultural preferences, food preferences, ethnic interaction
Mexican-Americans	language, religious beliefs, intermarriage	religious beliefs & practices, socialization		cultural preferences, ethnic interaction
Asian-Americans	reading & writing, ethnic interaction, ethnic identity, food preferences	cultural preferences, food preferences, ethnic interaction	cultural preferences, ethnic interaction	

Harris, A. C., & Verven, R. (1996). The Greek-American acculturation scale: development and validity. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 599-610.

Landrine, H., & Klonoff, E. (1995). The African American acculturation scale II: Cross validation and short form. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 21, 124-152.

Mendoza, R. H. (1989). An empirical scale to measure type and degree of acculturation in Mexican-American adolescents and adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20, 372-385.

Suinn, R. M., Rickaerd-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity acculturation scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47, 401-407.

Appendix B

Church Announcement

I would like to encourage all of the parishioners who are married to participate in a research study that will be exploring Greek-American marriages. The purpose of this study is to gather information regarding the dynamics of Greek-American couples, how they relate to one another and their perceptions of Greek and American culture.

Your participation will involve filling out five questionnaires that will take approximately thirty minutes. This is a onetime event and no further participation will be required.

The requirements to participate are as follows: you must be married and at least 18 years of age. Participants may or may not have children in order to participate. Couples living with their parent(s) will be unable to participate. The information is confidential and every measure possible has been taken to ensure anonymity. Light refreshments will also be available.

These data collecting sessions will take place after Sunday mass at approximately 12noon for the following few months (the exact dates cannot be announced at the current time due to the unknown time frame for IRB approval).

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact the researcher, Dr. Eric Johnson at (215) 762-1426 or the co-investigator, Fay Karapanagiotis at (609) 780-1546.

Appendix C
Father Dr. George Liacopulos' Permission Letter



METROPOLIS OF
NEW JERSEY

HOLY TRINITY GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH

Mill Road & Ridge Avenue, Egg Harbor Township, New Jersey · Phone: (609) 653-8092 · Fax: (609) 653-0375
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 769, Northfield, NJ 08215 · Web Address: www.HolyTrinitySouthJersey.org

October 26, 2006

Faye Karapanagiotis
12 Chestnut Oak Drive
Cape May Courthouse, NJ 08204

Dear Faye,

I am delighted at the opportunity to have you visit our Church in order to gather data for the surveys that you have prepared for your dissertation. I will encourage married couples to meet you after the Sunday morning Divine Liturgy so that they can fill out the surveys. I pray all the best for you as you continue your research.

Yours in Christ,

Father George Liacopulos

Appendix D
Consent Form

Subject's Initials: _____

Page 1 of: _____

Drexel University

Consent to Take Part
In a Research Study

1. Subject Name: _____
2. Title of Research: Greek-American Couples
3. Investigator's Name: Dr. Eric Johnson Co-Investigator: Fay T. Karapanagiotis
4. Research Entity:
Drexel University

5. Consenting for the Research Study:

This is a long and important document. If you sign it, you will be authorizing Drexel University and its researchers to perform research studies on you. You should take your time and carefully read it. You can also take a copy of this consent form to discuss it with your family member, attorney or any one else you would like before you sign it. Do not sign it unless you are comfortable in participating in this study.

6. Purpose of Research:

You are being asked to take participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to explore Greek-American marriages. Greek-American marriages are being investigated because very little research has examined the Greek-American culture and the way in which husbands and wives relate to one another. This research also partially fulfills the criteria needed in order to obtain my doctorate in couple and family therapy. Approximately 120 participants from a Southern Jersey Greek Orthodox Church will volunteer for this study. You are able participate in this study because you have met baseline criteria. The baseline

(continued)

Subject Initials: _____

Page 2 of: _____

criteria includes: couples who are married, participants over the age of eighteen, and participants who are Greek-American or married to a partner who is of Greek descent. Individuals under the age of eighteen and individuals not married are unable to participate for this study.

At any time, you may choose not to answer a question(s) that you do not feel comfortable answering. You may also withdraw from participating at any time.

7. Procedures and Duration:

You understand that you will be asked to fill out five questionnaires and the following data collection will take approximately 30 minutes. You will be asked about your views on relationships, as well as Greek and American culture. This data collection is a onetime event.

8. Risks and Discomforts/Constraints:

The potential threat to confidentiality and the possibility that subjects may begin to get emotionally upset thinking about their marital relationship. You may stop at any time if you are upset.

9. Unforeseen Risks:

Participation in this study may involve unforeseen risks. If unforeseen risks are seen, they will be reported to the Office of Research Compliance.

10. Benefits:

There may be no direct benefits from participating in this study.

11. Alternative Procedures/Treatments:

The alternative is not to participate in this study. Upon completing the questionnaires if you feel individual/couples therapy is warranted, referrals will be provided.

12. Voluntary Participation

Volunteers: Participation in this study is voluntary, and you can refuse to be in the study or stop at any time. There will be no negative consequences if you decide not to participate or to stop.

13. Responsibility for Cost: Participation in this study will be of no cost to you.

14. In Case of Injury:

(continued)

Subject Initials: _____

Page 3 of: _____

If you have any questions or believe you have been injured in any way by being in this research study, you should contact Dr. Eric Johnson at telephone number (215) 762-1426. However, neither the investigator nor Drexel University will make payment for injury, illness, or other loss resulting from your being in this research project. If you are injured by this research activity, medical care including hospitalization is available, but may result in costs to you or your insurance company because the University does not agree to pay for such costs. If you are injured or have an adverse reaction, you should also contact the Office of Research Compliance at 215-762-3453.

15. Confidentiality:

In any publication or presentation of research results, your identity will be kept confidential, but there is a possibility that records which identify you may be inspected by authorized individuals such as representatives of the couples and family therapy administration, the institutional review boards (IRBs), or employees conducting peer review activities. You consent to such inspections and to the copying of excerpts of your records, if required by any of these representatives.

16. Other Considerations:

If you wish further information regarding your rights as a research subject or if you have problems with a research-related injury, for medical problems please contact the Institution's Office of Research Compliance by telephoning 215-762-3453.

17. Consent:

- I have been informed of the reasons for this study.
- I have had the study explained to me.
- I have had all my questions answered.
- I have carefully read this consent form, have initialed each page, and have received a signed copy.
- I give consent voluntarily.

Subject_____
Date_____
Investigator or Individual Obtaining this Consent_____
Date_____
Witness to Signature_____
Date

Subject Initials: _____

Page 3 of: _____

If you have any questions or believe you have been injured in any way by being in this research study, you should contact Dr. Eric Johnson at telephone number (215) 762-1426. However, neither the investigator nor Drexel University will make payment for injury, illness, or other loss resulting from your being in this research project. If you are injured by this research activity, medical care including hospitalization is available, but may result in costs to you or your insurance company because the University does not agree to pay for such costs. If you are injured or have an adverse reaction, you should also contact the Office of Research Compliance at 215-762-3453.

15. Confidentiality:

In any publication or presentation of research results, your identity will be kept confidential, but there is a possibility that records which identify you may be inspected by authorized individuals such as representatives of the couples and family therapy administration, the institutional review boards (IRBs), or employees conducting peer review activities. You consent to such inspections and to the copying of excerpts of your records, if required by any of these representatives.

16. Other Considerations:

If you wish further information regarding your rights as a research subject or if you have problems with a research-related injury, for medical problems please contact the Institution's Office of Research Compliance by telephoning 215-762-3453.

17. Consent:

- I have been informed of the reasons for this study.
- I have had the study explained to me.
- I have had all my questions answered.
- I have carefully read this consent form, have initialed each page, and have received a signed copy.
- I give consent voluntarily.

Subject _____

Date _____

Investigator or Individual Obtaining this Consent _____

Date _____

Witness to Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix E
Personal Demographic Data

- 1.) Gender (circle one): Male or Female
- 2.) Age _____
- 3.) How long have you been married? _____
- 4.) How many children do you have? _____
- 5.) What is your ethnic background? _____
- 6.) Which country were you born in? _____
- 7.) Please circle which generation applies to you:
 - a) 1st generation (you were born outside of this country)
 - b) 2nd generation (you were born in this country and have one, or both parents born out of this country)
 - c) 3rd generation (you were born in this country, *and* both of your parents were also born in this country)
- 8.) How many years of schooling have you completed? (circle one)
 - a) Grade school (1-6 years)
 - b) Junior high (7-9 years)
 - c) Some high school (10-11 years)
 - d) High school graduate (12 years)
 - e) Some college (1-2 years)
 - f) College graduate (4 years)
 - g) Master's degree
 - h) PhD, M.D., D.D.S., J.D., etc.
- 9.) Please record the category that includes your annual income:

___ less than \$20,000	___ \$61,000 to \$80,000
___ \$21,000 to \$40,000	___ \$81,000 to \$100,000
___ \$41,000 to \$60,000	___ more than \$100,000

Appendix F
Greek-American Acculturation Scale

	Please circle the number that most clearly reflects your attitude about each of the following statements.	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1.	When I meet Greeks for the first time, it is important to find out if they speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Greek-Americans should be married in the Greek Church.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	When I have children they will attend Greek school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	I would not marry someone who is not Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	It's alright not to attend church if you have to work on Sundays.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	It is important for Greek –Americans to read Greek newspapers.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	My best friends are Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	I like to eat most traditional Greek foods.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	I feel more comfortable around Greeks than around non-Greeks.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	It is important that the person I marry know how to speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	My parents insisted that I learn how to speak Greek when I was growing up.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	A woman should not receive communion during her menstrual period.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	There should be more Greek schools.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	I listen to Greek music.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Boys should be given more freedom than girls.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Greek parents should insist that their children attend Greek Church.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Children should never question their parent's decision.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Question	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree
18.	It was important to me that the person(s) I dated know how to speak Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
19.	It is better to marry a poor Greek than a rich non-Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
20.	Given the choice, I'd rather speak Greek than English.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
21.	I believe in the teachings of the Greek Church.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
22.	All Greek-Americans should be fluent in Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
23.	I have conversations in Greek with my friends.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
24.	Most of my close friends speak Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
25.	It's alright for a Greek-American to marry someone who is not Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
26.	I believe that the sermon in the Greek Church should be delivered in English.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
27.	I know how to prepare most traditional Greek foods.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
28.	Had my parents not insisted that I do so, I would not have learned to speak English.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
29.	I write letters to my friends in Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
30.	I want my children to be raised Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
31.	I speak Greek better than most of my friends.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
32.	I would not like for a child of mine to date someone who is not Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
33.	I enjoy being Greek.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
34.	I attended Greek school when I was growing up.	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
35.	My mother makes <i>baklava</i> .	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		

	Question	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
36.	I'm lucky to have been born Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
37.	It is important for Greek-American children to attend Greek school.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
38.	I have conversations in Greek with my family.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
39.	I eat <i>mageritsa</i> on Easter.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
40.	It is important to me that my children know how to speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
41.	It bothers me that some Greek-Americans don't know how to speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
42.	Most of my close friends attended Greek school.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
43.	I believe that English should replace Greek in the Church liturgy.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
44.	I don't trust most non-Greeks.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
45.	If I suddenly became sick when I was growing up, my mother would test me for <i>mati</i> .	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
46.	My friends and I have conversations in Greek so that non-Greeks around us won't know what we're saying.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
47.	I can have a conversation about anything in Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
48.	I read Greek newspapers.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
49.	Some of my best friends are non-Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
50.	Greek should be the language of the world.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
51.	I would not date anyone who is not Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
52.	I read Greek magazines.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
53.	Greeks are closer to God than non-Greeks.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
54.	I know how to make <i>baklava</i> .	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7

	Question	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree	Neutral	Strongly Agree
55.	When I was young my mother would pin a picture of the Virgin Mary inside my clothes.	0	1 2 3	4 5 6 7	
56.	Greek school was an important part of my childhood development.	0	1 2 3	4 5 6 7	

Appendix G
Vancouver Index of Acculturation Modified

	Please circle the number that most clearly reflects your attitude about each of the following statements.	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
1.	In order to succeed I need to be fluent in English.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
2.	I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
3.	I would be willing to marry an American person.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
4.	I enjoy social activities with typical American people.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
5.	I am comfortable working with typical American people.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
6.	I enjoy American entertainment (for example, movies and music).	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
7.	I often behave in ways that are 'typically American.'	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
8.	It is important for me to maintain or develop American cultural practices.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
9.	I believe in mainstream American values.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
10.	I enjoy typical American jokes.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
11.	I am interested in having American friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7

Appendix H
Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships

	Please circle the number that most clearly reflects your marital relationship currently.	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
1.	My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
2.	We enjoy spending time with other couples.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
3.	I am satisfied with the level of affection in our relationship.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
4.	My partner helps me clarify my thoughts and feelings.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
5.	We enjoy the same recreational activities.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
6.	My partner has all the qualities I've always wanted in a mate.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
7.	I can state my feelings without him/her getting defensive.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
8.	As a couple, we usually "keep to ourselves."	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
9.	I feel our level of affection is just routine.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
10.	When having a serious discussion, it seems we have little in common.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
11.	I share in few of my partner's interests.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
12.	There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
13.	I often feel distant from my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
14.	We have few friends in common.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
15.	I am able to tell my partner when I want sexual intimacy.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
16.	I feel "put down" in a serious conversation with my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5 6 7

	Question	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree		
17.	We like playing and having fun together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Every new thing I have learned about my partner has pleased me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	My partner can really understand my hurts and joys.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	Having time together with friends is an important part of our shared activities.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	Because of my partner's lack of caring, I "hold back" my sexual interest.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	I feel it is useless to discuss some things with my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	We enjoy the out-of-doors together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	My partner and I understand each other completely.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	I feel neglected at times by my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	Many of my partner's closest friends are also my closest friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	Sexual expression is an essential part of our relationship.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	My partner seldom tries to change my ideas.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	We seldom find time to do fun things together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	My partner has some negative traits that bother me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	I sometimes feel lonely when we're together.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	My partner disapproves of some of my friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33.	My partner seems disinterested in sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34.	We have an endless number of things to talk about.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35.	We share few of the same interests.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36.	I have some needs that are not being met by my relationship.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix I
Egalitarian Questionnaire

	Question	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree		
1.	My partner frequently initiates physical intimacy.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	I feel I can discuss anything with my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	My partner believes that what I have to say is important.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	My partner lets me know that he/she appreciates what I do for our family.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	My partner and I usually share doing the household chores.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	My partner will usually hold my hand in public.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	My partner usually helps in caring for our child(ren).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	My partner frequently hugs and kisses our child(ren).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	My partner expected that he/she would be the only one that I had sexual relations prior to our marriage.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	My partner encourages me to have friendships with others.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	My partner will kiss me goodbye/hello, regardless of where we are.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	My partner approves of friendships with the opposite gender.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	If I have more education than my partner he/she would feel threatened.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	My partner values both of us working outside of the home.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	If I make more money than my partner, he/she would feel threatened.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(continued)

16.	My partner tells me he/she loves me on a regular basis.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Appendix J

Researcher's Instructions

I would like to welcome and thank everyone for taking the time to attend today's data collection session. As you make yourselves comfortable and get ready to fill out the survey instruments I would just like to go over a couple of things.

Please keep your answers to yourself, **do not** share your answers or discuss your answers with anyone, including your partner. If you have a question regarding any of the questions/statements please let me know. Once you have finished please put all of your surveys in the envelope that has been provided. Make certain that you and your partner have both put all of your surveys in the same envelope. Seal the envelope and put it in the box by the door.


Please take your time and thank you again.

Appendix K

Debriefing

I would again like to thank everyone for taking the time to participate in my data collecting process. In the event that anyone may feel much different, emotionally, than when he/she first arrived I would like to give you Father Dr. George's contact information. Father George would be able to provide you with the care that you may need.

Appendix L
Permission to Use the VIA

From: "Andrew G. Ryder" <andrew.ryder@concordia.ca> |  [Save to Address Book](#) | [Block Sender](#)
To: "fahnoula@netzero.net" <fahnoula@netzero.net>
Subject: Re: Vancouver Index of Acculturation
Date: Sat, Jul 19, 2008 11:16 AM

[Reply](#) ▼ [Reply All](#) ▼ [Report as Junk](#) ▼ [Move message to...](#) ▼ [Print](#)

Dear Fay,

Please feel free to use the VIA. I'll be interested in hearing about your findings once your study is complete. Let me know if you have any further questions about the instrument.

Andrew Ryder

Appendix M

Vancouver Index of Acculturation

strongly disagree		disagree		neutral/depends		agree		strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

1. I often participate in my *heritage cultural* traditions.
2. I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions.
3. I would be willing to marry a person from my *heritage culture*.
4. I would be willing to marry an American person.
5. I enjoy social activities with people from the same *heritage culture* as myself.
6. I enjoy social activities with typical American people.
7. I am comfortable working with people of the same *heritage culture* as myself.
8. I am comfortable working with typical American people.
9. I enjoy entertainment (e.g., movies, music) from my *heritage culture*.
10. I enjoy American entertainment (e.g., movies, music).
11. I often behave in ways that are typical of my *heritage culture*.
12. I often behave in ways that are 'typically American'.
13. It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my *heritage culture*.
14. It is important for me to maintain or develop American cultural practices.
15. I believe in the values of my *heritage culture*.
16. I believe in mainstream American values.
17. I enjoy the jokes and humor of my *heritage culture*.
18. I enjoy typical American jokes and humor.
19. I am interested in having friends from my *heritage culture*.
20. I am interested in having American friends.

Appendix N

Scoring the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships

A. Scoring of Part I: "How It Is Now"

Each of the five types of intimacy as well as conventionality will be scored using the same three-step process.

#1- For example, **Step One** for emotional intimacy would be scored by adding the values of items #1, #7, and #19. Place this sum on the line next to the word "Sum". Then multiply this sum by 4 and place this number next to "Total 1".

#2-Sum of the values of items #13, #25, and #31. Place the sum on the blank line. Subtract this sum from 12 and place this sum on the next blank line. Multiply this sum by 4 and place this number next to "Total 2".

#3-Add Total 1 and Total 2 and place this sum next to "Overall Total".

Repeat this process until all scoring columns are completed.

B. Scoring of Part II: "How I Would Like It To Be"

In order to score this part of the scale, you will add the items in each box and then multiply that sum by four.

Interpreting the scores

A. The Range of Scores:

How do most couples score on the inventory? In a non-clinical sample of 384 individuals (192 married couples), we found the following tendencies.

The absolute range of scores is 0 to 96. We found that except for Social Intimacy and Conventionality, the average perceived score fell between 42 and 58 for each scale (N=384 non-clinical sample). The average score for Social Intimacy was somewhat higher ($\bar{x}=61$) and for conventionality was somewhat lower ($\bar{x}=38$).

The important point to realize is that there is no ideal amount of intimacy. While one couple may perceive themselves in the 50 range and expect their relationship to be in the high 80's, another couple may perceive themselves in the 50's and only expect their relationship to be in the same range.

(continued)

The purpose for the PAIR is not to establish any standards for high or low intimacy but to help describe the perceived intimacy and expected intimacy for a given couple.

B. Interpreting the Results

First, high scores on the PAIR for “perceived” relationship generally indicates higher intimacy. The unique value of the perceived versus expected scores on PAIR is that each individual and couple decide for themselves what is “perceived” and “ideal” for them. This is indicated by their discrepancy between perceived and expected.

Counselors should use the PAIR as a tool by which couples can take a closer look at their relationship, articulate the areas of intimacy they wish to improve, and to find support for the areas in which they already have strength.

Second, the best interpretation of the scores can be made by comparing the differences between each partner’s perceived and expected scores.

C. Conventionality Score

First, examine the conventionality score. This indicates the extent to which an individual is responding to PAIR in a socially desirable fashion. The higher the conventionality score, the more the individual is responding in a socially desirable way. The individual is, perhaps, trying to look good and tends to minimize any problems in his/her relationship.

For the PAIR, any conventionality score above 55 is considered “very high,” and any score below 20 is considered “very low”

Appendix O

Permission Letter to Use the PAIR



PREPARE/ENRICH
LIFE INNOVATIONS, INC.
P.O. Box 190 • Minneapolis, MN 55440-0190
800-331-1661 • 651-635-0511 • FAX: 651-636-1668
www.prepare-enrich.com

2006

Permission to Use PAIR

I am pleased to give you **permission to use PAIR** in your research project, teaching, or clinical work with couples and families. You can either duplicate the materials directly or have them retyped for use in a new format. If they are retyped, acknowledgement should be given regarding the name of the instrument, the developers' names, the University of Minnesota and Life Innovations, Inc.

In exchange for providing this permission, we would appreciate a copy of any papers, thesis, or reports that you complete using these inventories. This will help us in staying abreast of the most recent development and research with these scales. Thank you for your cooperation.

In closing, I hope you find **PAIR** of value in your work with couples and families. I would appreciate hearing from you as you make use of this inventory.

Sincerely,

David H. Olson, Ph.D.

AWARE	PREPARE	PREPARE-CC	PREPARE-MC	ENRICH	MATE
	Building Relationships	Empowering Couples	Marriage Mentor Program		

Appendix P
Greek-American Acculturation Scale Revised

	Please circle the number that most clearly reflects your attitude about each of the following statements.	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1.	When I meet Greeks for the first time, it is important to find out if they speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Greek-Americans should be married in the Greek Church.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	When I have children they will attend Greek school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	It's alright not to attend church if you have to work on Sundays.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	It is important for Greek –Americans to read Greek newspapers.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	My best friends are Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	I like to eat most traditional Greek foods.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	I feel more comfortable around Greeks than around non-Greeks.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	It is important that the person I marry know how to speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	My parents insisted that I learn how to speak Greek when I was growing up.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	A woman should not receive communion during her menstrual period.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	There should be more Greek schools.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	I listen to Greek music.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Boys should be given more freedom than girls.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Greek parents should insist that their children attend Greek Church.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Children should never question their parent's decision.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Question	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree		
17.	It was important to me that the person(s) I dated know how to speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
18.	Given the choice, I'd rather speak Greek than English.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
19.	I believe in the teachings of the Greek Church.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
20.	All Greek-Americans should be fluent in Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
21.	I have conversations in Greek with my friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
22.	Most of my close friends speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
23.	I believe that the sermon in the Greek Church should be delivered in English.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
24.	I know how to prepare most traditional Greek foods.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
25.	Had my parents not insisted that I do so, I would not have learned to speak English.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
26.	I write letters to my friends in Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
27.	I want my children to be raised Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
28.	I speak Greek better than most of my friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
29.	I enjoy being Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
30.	I attended Greek school when I was growing up.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
31.	My mother makes <i>baklava</i> .	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
32.	I'm lucky to have been born Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
33.	It is important for Greek-American children to attend Greek school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
34.	I have conversations in Greek with my family.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		

	Question	Not Applicable	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
35.	I eat <i>mageritsa</i> on Easter.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36.	It is important to me that my children know how to speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37.	It bothers me that some Greek-Americans don't know how to speak Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38.	Most of my close friends attended Greek school.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39.	I believe that English should replace Greek in the Church liturgy.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40.	I don't trust most non-Greeks.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41.	If I suddenly became sick when I was growing up, my mother would test me for <i>mati</i> .	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42.	My friends and I have conversations in Greek so that non-Greeks around us won't know what we're saying.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43.	I can have a conversation about anything in Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44.	I read Greek newspapers.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45.	Some of my best friends are non-Greek.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46.	Greek should be the language of the world.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47.	I read Greek magazines.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48.	Greeks are closer to God than non-Greeks.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49.	I know how to make <i>baklava</i> .	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50.	When I was young my mother would pin a picture of the Virgin Mary inside my clothes.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51.	Greek school was an important part of my childhood development.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix Q

GAAS Scale and Subscales' Reliabilities

Item-Total Statistics	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
First time I meet Greeks it's important to find out if they speak Greek	.613	.966
GA should be married in the Greek Church	.678	.966
When I have child they will attend Greek school	.602	.966
I would not marry someone who is not Greek	.566	.966
It's alright not to attend church on Sundays if working	.152	.967
Important for GA to read Greek newspapers	.474	.967
My best friends are Greek	.617	.966
I like to eat most traditional Greek foods	.440	.967
I feel more comfortable around Greeks than non-Greeks	.592	.966
Important that the person I marry speak Greek	.738	.966
My parents insisted that I learn to speak Greek when I was growing up	.754	.966
Woman shouldn't receive communion during their menstrual period	.524	.966
There should be more Greek schools	.714	.966
I listen to Greek music	.696	.966
Boys should be given more freedom than girls	.432	.967
Greek parents should insist that their child attend Greek Church	.737	.966
Child should never question their parent's decision	.175	.967
Important to me that the person(s) I dated know how to speak Greek	.745	.966
Better to marry a poor Greek than a rich non-Greek	.566	.966
Given the choice, I'd rather speak Greek than English	.757	.966
I believe in the teachings of the Greek Church	.676	.966
All GA should be fluent in Greek	.598	.966
I have conversations in Greek with my friends	.828	.965
Most of my close friends speak Greek	.705	.966
It's alright for a GA to marry someone who is not Greek	-.396	.969
I believe that the sermon in the Greek Church should be delivered in English	-.272	.969
I know how to prepare most traditional Greek foods	.551	.966
Had my parents not insisted that I do so, I wouldn't have learned to speak English	.428	.967
I write letters to my friends in Greek	.641	.966
I want my children to be raised Greek	.637	.966
I speak Greek better than most of my friends	.850	.965
I wouldn't like for a child of mine to date someone who isn't Greek	.537	.966
I enjoy being Greek	.813	.965
I attended Greek school when I was growing up	.780	.966
My mother makes baklava	.731	.966
I'm lucky to have been born Greek	.874	.965
It's important for GA child to attend Greek school	.719	.966
I have conversations in Greek with my family	.845	.965
I eat mageritsa on Easter	.523	.967
It's important to me that my child knows how to speak Greek	.692	.966
It bothers me that some GA don't know how to speak Greek	.668	.966
Most of my close friends attended Greek school	.745	.966
I believe that English should replace Greek in the Church liturgy	-.235	.968
I don't trust most non-Greeks	.374	.967
If suddenly sick growing up, my mother would test me for mati	.619	.966
My friends & I have conversations in Greek so that non-Greeks won't know what we're saying	.670	.966
I can have a conversation about anything in Greek	.826	.965
I read Greek newspapers	.772	.966
Some of my best friends are non-Greek	-.190	.969
Greek should be the language of the world	.612	.966
I would not date anyone who is not Greek	.497	.967
I read Greek magazines	.741	.966
Greeks are closer to God than non-Greeks	.432	.967
I know how to make baklava	.277	.967
When I was young my mother would pin a picture of the Virgin Mary inside my clothes	.553	.966
Greek school was an important part of my childhood development	.799	.965

(continued)

GAAS Overall Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.967	56

Greek Language

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.897	15

Contact w/Greek Mass Media

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.842	4

Greek School Attendance

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.883	6

Traditional Greek Religious Beliefs & Superstitions

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.736	8

Ethnic Identity/Practices & Interracial Attitudes

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.869	14

Preparation & Consumption of Traditional Foods

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.706	4

Intermarriage & Dating Behavior

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.188	5

Appendix R GAASR Factor Analysis

Rotated Component Matrix(a)	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
I have conversations in Greek with my family	.800				
I'm lucky to have been born Greek	.787				
I attended Greek school when I was growing up	.785				
I can have a conversation about anything in Greek	.785				
I have conversations in Greek with my friends	.751				
I speak Greek better than most of my friends	.739				
My parents insisted that I learn to speak Greek when I was growing up	.738				
I enjoy being Greek	.726				
Greek school was an important part of my childhood development	.724				
My friends & I have conversations in Greek so that non-Greeks won't know what we're saying	.719				
My mother makes baklava	.682				
Most of my close friends attended Greek school	.655				
If suddenly sick growing up, my mother would test me for mati	.541				
Important that the person I marry speak Greek	.539			.452	
I believe in the teachings of the Greek Church	.488				
Important to me that the person(s) I dated know how to speak Greek	.478			.472	
There should be more Greek schools					
When I have child they will attend Greek school		.789			
I want my children to be raised Greek		.741			
It's Important for GA child to attend Greek school		.644			

Rotated Component Matrix(a)	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
Greek parents should insist that their child attend Greek Church		.631			
GA should be married in the Greek Church		.613			
It's important to me that my child know how to speak Greek	.451	.581			
I listen to Greek music		.562			
I like to eat most traditional Greek foods		.522			
I don't trust most non-Greeks			.741		
Greeks are closer to God than non-Greeks			.683		
Greek should be the language of the world			.588		
Woman shouldn't receive communion during their menstrual period			.499		
First time I meet Greeks it's important to find out if they speak Greek			.492		
It bothers me that some GA don't know how to speak Greek					
Given the choice, I'd rather speak Greek than English					
I read Greek magazines				.723	
I write letters to my friends in Greek				.706	
I read Greek newspapers				.638	
Important for GA to read Greek newspapers				.451	
Most of my close friends speak Greek					.674
My best friends are Greek					.610
All GA should be fluent in Greek					.553

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

Appendix S VIAM Scale Reliabilities

Item-Total Statistics	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
In order to succeed I need to be fluent in English	.473	.918
I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions	.782	.901
I would be willing to marry an American person	.567	.918
I enjoy social activities with typical American people	.803	.901
I am comfortable working with typical American people	.731	.906
I enjoy American entertainment (movies & music)	.658	.909
I often behave in ways that are 'typically American'	.691	.906
It's important for me to maintain or develop American cultural practices	.788	.901
I believe in mainstream American values	.631	.909
I enjoy typical American jokes	.716	.906
I'm interested in having American friends	.741	.904

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.915	11

Appendix T VIAM Factor Analysis

Rotated Component Matrix	Component	
	1	2
I enjoy American entertainment (movies & music)	.888	
I am comfortable working with typical American people	.843	
I enjoy social activities with typical American people	.762	
I often behave in ways that are 'typically American'	.721	
I'm interested in having American friends	.692	
I would be willing to marry an American person	.609	
It's important for me to maintain or develop American cultural practices		.821
I believe in mainstream American values		.772
I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions		.762
In order to succeed I need to be fluent in English		.725
I enjoy typical American jokes	.516	.593

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
 a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Component Transformation Matrix

Co.	1	2
1	.758	.652
2	-.652	.758

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Appendix U PAIR and Subscales' Reliabilities

Item-Total Statistics	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to	.593	.915
We enjoy spending time with other couples	.421	.917
I'm satisfied with the level of affection in our relationship	.638	.914
My partner helps me clarify my thoughts & feelings	.525	.916
We enjoy the same recreational activities	.492	.916
My partner has all the qualities I've ever wanted in a mate	.621	.915
I can state my feelings w/out him/her getting defensive	.568	.915
As a couple we usually "keep to ourselves"	.341	.918
I feel our level of affection is just routine	.451	.917
When having a serious discussion, it seems we have little in common	.506	.916
I share in few of my partner's interests	.309	.918
There are times when I don't feel a great deal of love & affection for my partner	.460	.916
I often feel distant from my partner	.690	.913
We have few friends in common	.339	.918
I'm able to tell my partner when I want sexual intimacy	.495	.916
I feel "put down" in a serious conversation w/ my partner	.469	.916
We like playing & having fun together	.380	.917
Every new thing I've learned about my partner has pleased me	.392	.917
My partner can really understand my hurts & joys	.615	.915
Having time together w/ friends is an important part of our shared activities	.428	.917
Because of my partner's lack of caring, "I hold back" my sexual interest	.674	.914
I feel it's useless to discuss some things w/ my partner	.706	.913
We enjoy the out-of-doors together	-.001	.922

Item-Total Statistics	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
My partner & I understand each other completely	.637	.914
I feel neglected at times by my partner	.599	.915
Many of my partner's closest friends are also my closest friends	.295	.919
Sexual expression is an essential part of our relationship	.509	.916
My partner seldom tries to change my ideas	.098	.921
We seldom find time to do fun things together	.388	.917
My partner has some negative traits that bother me	.476	.916
I sometimes feel lonely when we're together	.679	.914
My partner disapproves of some of my friends	.384	.918
My partner seems disinterested in sex	.444	.917
We have an endless number of things to talk about	.491	.916
We share few of the same interests	.392	.917
I have some needs that aren't being met by my relationship	.660	.914

Overall Scale

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.918	36

Intellectual Intimacy

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.671	6

Emotional Intimacy

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.816	6

Recreational Intimacy

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.543	6

Sexual Intimacy

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.785	6

Social Intimacy

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.631	6

Appendix V PAIR Factor Analysis

Rotated Component Matrix	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
My partner can really understand my hurts & joys	.768							
I sometimes feel lonely when we're together	.748							
My partner has some negative traits that bother me	.729							
My partner helps me clarify my thoughts & feelings	.710							
My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to	.687							
My partner and I understand each other completely	.680							
I can state my feelings w/out him/her getting defensive	.671							
My partner has all the qualities I've ever wanted in a mate	.624							
I have some needs that aren't being met by my relationship	-.605							
I often feel distant from my partner	-.580							
I feel it's useless to discuss some things w/my partner	-.570							
I'm satisfied with the level of affection in our relationship	.552	.531						
I feel "put down" in a serious conversation w/my partner	-.530							
We have an endless number of things to talk about								
Having time together w/friends is an important part of our shared activities		.803						
We enjoy spending time with other couples		.637						
Many of my partner's closest friends are also my closest friends		.593						
We enjoy the same recreational activities		.583						
We seldom find time to do fun things together		-.515						
We like playing and having fun together			.727					
I'm able to tell my partner when I want sexual intimacy			.695					
Sexual expression is an essential part of our relationship			.695					
I share in few of my partner's interests				.811				
We share few of the same interests				.674				
When having a serious discussion, it seems we have little in common				.574				

(continued)

Rotated Component Matrix	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Because of my partner's lack of caring, "I hold back" my sexual interest								
I feel our level of affection is just routine					.694			
I feel neglected at times by my partner	-.570				.601			
My partner seldom tries to change my ideas								
My partner disapproves of some of my friends						.779		
My partner seems disinterested in sex								
There are times when I don't feel a great deal of love & affection for my partner							.774	
We have few friends in common								.789
Every new thing I've learned about my partner has pleased me								
As a couple we usually "keep to ourselves"								
We enjoy the out-of-doors together								

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 24 iterations.

Appendix W EQR Factor Analysis

Rotated Component Matrix	Component		
	1	2	3
my partner lets me know that he/she appreciates what I do for our family	.821		
I feel I can discuss anything w/ my partner	.744		
my partner & I usually share doing the household chores	.742		
my partner believes that what I have to say is important	.738		
my partner will kiss me goodbye/hello, regardless of where we are		.879	
my partner tells me he/she loves me on a regular basis		.816	
my partner will usually hold my hand in public		.710	
my partner values both of us working outside of the home			.699
my partner approves of friendships with the opposite gender			.679
my partner encourages me to have friendships w/ others			.663
my partner frequently initiates physical intimacy			.514

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Component Transformation Matrix

Co...	1	2	3
1	.667	.700	.255
2	-.504	.172	.847
3	.549	-.693	.467

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Appendix X

EQ, EQR and Subscales' Reliabilities

EQ Scale

Item-Total Statistics	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
my partner frequently initiates physical intimacy	.177	.490
I feel I can discuss anything w/my partner	.444	.446
my partner believes that what I have to say is important	.400	.457
my partner lets me know that he/she appreciates what I do for our family	.254	.479
my partner & I usually share doing the household chores	.091	.510
my partner will usually hold my hand in public	.332	.458
my partner usually helps in caring for our child(ren)	.180	.493
my partner frequently hugs & kisses our child(ren)	.251	.471
my partner expected he/she would be the only one that I had sexual relations prior to our mar.	-.199	.579
my partner encourages me to have friendship w/others	.272	.472
my partner will kiss me goodbye/hello regardless of where we are	.420	.442
my partner approves of friendships with the opposite gender	.296	.462
if I have more education than my partner he/she would feel threatened	-.267	.564
my partner values both of us working outside of the home	.019	.527
if I make more money than my partner, he/she would feel threatened	-.036	.524
my partner tells me he/she loves me on a regular basis	.429	.440

EQR Scale

Item-Total Statistics	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
my partner frequently initiates physical intimacy	.181	.740
I feel I can discuss anything w/my partner	.628	.682
my partner believes that what I have to say is important	.592	.689
my partner lets me know that he/she appreciates what I do for our family	.332	.718
my partner & I usually share doing the household chores	.305	.724
my partner will usually hold my hand in public	.448	.701
my partner encourages me to have friendships w/others	.411	.707
my partner will kiss me goodbye/hello, regardless of where we are	.558	.686
my partner approves of friendships with the opposite gender	.278	.728
my partner values both of us working outside of the home	.061	.763
my partner tells me he/she loves me on a regular basis	.610	.678

(continued)

Original EQ

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.507	16

Openness

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.732	4

EQ Revised

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.731	11

Engagement

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.544	4

Affection

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.806	3

